

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



FILED

02-05-07

02:46 PM

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider the Adoption of
a General Order and Procedures to Implement the Digital
Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006.

R.06-10-005
(Filed October 5, 2006)

**OPENING COMMENTS OF
AT&T CALIFORNIA (U 1001 C)
ON THE
PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER CHONG,
MAILED JANUARY 16, 2006**

James B. Young
David J. Miller
AT&T Services Legal Department
525 Market Street, Room 2018
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: (415) 778-1393
Fax: (281) 664-9478
davidjmilller@att.com

February 5, 2007

SUBJECT INDEX

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. DISCUSSION	2
A. THE PROPOSED DECISION SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO CLARIFY THAT IT DOES NOT GRANT LOCAL ENTITIES ANY AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE SECURITY INSTRUMENTS IN ADDITION TO THE AUTHORITY THEY ALREADY HAVE.	2
B. THE PROPOSED DECISION SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO CLARIFY THAT THE BOND MAXIMUM WILL BE APPLIED PER APPLICANT.	4
C. THE PROPOSED DECISION SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO CLARIFY THAT THE NONDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENTS OF DIVCA APPLY TO THE ENTIRE VIDEO SERVICE AREA, AND NOT ON A PER NONCONTIGUOUS AREA BASIS.	4
D. THE PROPOSED DECISION SHOULD BE REVISED TO ADDRESS PROPER IDENTIFICATION OF PARTIAL SERVICE OF CENSUS BLOCK GROUPS.....	5
E. THE PROPOSED DECISION’S REPORTING REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE REVISED	6
1. <i>Improperly Expanded Application Reporting Requirements Should Be Removed.</i>	6
2. <i>The Proposed Requirements To Report The Number Of Video Customers And The Extent Of Use Of Other Broadband Technologies Should Be Removed. ..</i>	7
3. <i>Requests That Trade Secret Information Be Kept Confidential Should Be Honored</i>	8
4. <i>The Requirement That No Alternate Geospatial Area Include More Than 1,000 Households Should Be Removed</i>	10
F. THE PROPOSED DECISION SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE THE COMMISSION’S LIMITED ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY	10
G. THE PROPOSED APPLICATION FORM SHOULD BE REVISED.	12
III. CONCLUSION	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

Constitutions and Statutes

California Civil Code Sections 3426 <i>et seq.</i> (Uniform Trade Secrets Act)	9
California Evidence Code Section 1060	9
California Government Code, Section 6254(k).....	9
California Streets & Highways Code Section 1468	2
California Public Utilities Code, Section 5810	1, 4
California Public Utilities Code, Section 5840	6-7
California Public Utilities Code, Section 5885(c)(2)	1
California Public Utilities Code, Section 5890	<i>passim</i>
California Public Utilities Code, Section 5920(b)	9
California Public Utilities Code, Section 5960	7-8

California Cases

Cal. School Employees Ass'n v. Sunnyvale Elementary School Dist. of Santa Clara County (1973), 36 Cal.App.3d 46	9
Pacific Bell Telephone Company v. The City of Walnut Creek, Contra Costa County Super. Ct. Case No. C-06-00850, Order Granting AT&T's Motion for Judgment on Peremptory Writ (Dec. 11, 2006).....	3

Pacific Bell Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T California (hereinafter, “AT&T California” or “AT&T”)), pursuant to the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, provides the following opening comments on the **Proposed Decision of Commissioner Chong**, mailed January 16, 2006 (hereinafter, “Proposed Decision”).

I. INTRODUCTION

AT&T California believes the Proposed Decision is a significant step toward giving Californians the video choice they deserve. In the words of AB 2987, or the Digital Infrastructure And Video Competition Act of 2006 (“DIVCA”),

Increased competition in the cable and video service sector provides consumers with more choice, lowers prices, speeds the deployment of new communication and broadband technologies, creates jobs, and benefits the California economy.¹

With this in mind, the Proposed Decision properly would adopt a streamlined and timely franchising process, as directed by DIVCA, that will usher in competition into California’s video market to benefit California’s economy and its consumers. This is consistent with DIVCA’s provisions that mandate a specific, efficient application process to “*timely process* applications of video service providers....”² and increase the number of competitors in the video service market quickly.

With this Proposed Decision, and the corrections and clarifications identified in these opening comments, AT&T California and other competitors will be able to roll out innovative and exciting new video services, and finally offer Californians a true choice for video. Californians deserve no less and no later.

¹ Pub. Util. Code § 5810(a)(1)(B).

² Pub. Util. Code § 5810(a)(3) (emphasis added).

II. DISCUSSION

AT&T California discusses below the major issues raised by the Proposed Decision. For the Commission's convenience, AT&T California also attaches proposed specific changes to the General Order and application form that reflect the issues discussed herein, as well as additional, relatively minor or non-substantive changes.³

A. The Proposed Decision Should Be Modified To Clarify That It Does Not Grant Local Entities Any Authority To Impose Security Instruments In Addition To The Authority They Already Have.

While AT&T supports generally the bonding requirement imposed by the Commission, AT&T is quite concerned with the Commission's statements that "local entities may require further security instruments as part of their oversight of local rights-of-way."⁴ These statements are unnecessary to support the Commission's decision and could undermine rather than promote investment in broadband infrastructure.

First, the language could lead to disputes over the scope of a local entity's authority. For example, the Streets & Highway Code strictly limits a county's ability to impose bonds on public utilities,⁵ yet the Commission's statements make no mention of this limitation. If a county were to misinterpret the Commission's statements as an independent grant of authority, video providers would no doubt challenge that claim and investment would be delayed until the dispute was resolved.

³ See Attachment B hereto.

⁴ Proposed Decision, p. 71. The Commission repeats this statement on page 75: "Local entities may require additional security instruments to ensure proper treatment of their local residents and usage of their local rights-of-way."

⁵ "Except as otherwise provided in this section, such a bond shall not be required of any public agency or public utility having lawful authority to occupy the highways which is authorized by law to establish or maintain any works or facilities in, under or over any public highway, nor shall the application of any such public agency or public utility for a permit be denied. The road commissioner may require of any such applicant a bond in a sum not to exceed twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000), if such applicant has in fact prior to such application failed to comply with the provisions of this chapter or with the provisions of a previous permit." Sts. & High. Code § 1468.

Second, the Commission's statements could embolden local entities to alter what AT&T generally considers to be a reasonable compromise to local government bonding developed over many years. For most local entities, bonding is discretionary and historically has not been applied to ILECs with resources and long-standing proper use of public rights-of way, such as AT&T. The Commission's repeated emphasis on local bonding, however, may invite local entities to reexamine their sound practices and seek to unnecessarily impose bonding simply because the Commission has suggested they could. That would be most unfortunate, particularly if it leads to delays in processing construction permits and investment.

AT&T's concerns are not mere conjecture – they are based on real world experience. For nearly two years now, AT&T has been working aggressively to upgrade its telephone network to be able to provide next-generation voice, video and data services. The upgrade has been slowed or even stopped in some areas of the state because of issues related to use of public rights-of-way, including misinterpretations of what the law does and does not require.⁶ AT&T is not suggesting ill motives are driving all the disputes; it is merely pointing out that even relatively minor misunderstandings such as this can have major impacts on network upgrades and consequently undermine the goals of AB 2987 to introduce video competition.

The Commission should seek to avoid inadvertently creating a climate for rights-of-way disputes that could disturb video competition. Consistent with the legislation, the Commission should do just the opposite, *i.e.*, unequivocally declare that unreasonable attempts to block rights-of-way access will not be tolerated. Indeed, the clear intent of the Legislature was to “speed the deployment of new communication and broadband technologies” and “increase

⁶ See, e.g., *Pacific Bell Telephone Company v. The City of Walnut Creek*, Contra Costa County Super. Ct. Case No. C-06-00850, *Order Granting AT&T's Motion for Judgment on Peremptory Writ* (Dec. 11, 2006).

investment in broadband infrastructure” (*e.g.*, Pub. Util. Code § 5810(a)(1)(B), (2)(E)), and the Act provides an express deadline for local entities to approve permit applications. Pub. Util. Code § 5885(c)(2). The municipal imposition of barriers or delays to access to public rights-of-way risks impairing these and other goals of DIVCA, including the build-out and non-discrimination objectives. Getting the necessary infrastructure built is therefore among the highest priorities.

B. The Proposed Decision Should Be Modified To Clarify That The Bond Maximum Will Be Applied Per Applicant.

The Proposed Decision would require “a bond in the amount of \$100,000 per 20,000 households in a proposed video service area, with a required \$100,000 minimum,” and “a cap of \$500,000.”⁷ The language is somewhat unclear regarding whether the bond maximum would apply per video franchise applicant, or per noncontiguous video service area. Applying the cap per noncontiguous video service area could result in a bond amount high enough to pose a substantial barrier to video competition. A \$500,000 bond per applicant is more than adequate, especially given the security instrument authority local authorities already possess. Accordingly, AT&T California requests the Proposed Decision be clarified to indicate that the bond maximum applies per applicant.

C. The Proposed Decision Should Be Modified To Clarify That The Nondiscrimination Requirements Of DIVCA Apply To The Entire Video Service Area, And Not On A Per Noncontiguous Area Basis.

The Proposed Decision’s division of the video service territory into noncontiguous areas⁸ raises the question whether the non-discrimination requirements of DIVCA⁹ might be applied

⁷ Proposed Decision, p. 73.

⁸ *See id.* at 44.

⁹ Pub. Util. Code § 5890.

per noncontiguous area, rather than to a provider's entire video service area as a whole. It is clear that the non-discrimination requirements set forth in section 5890¹⁰ of DIVCA are intended to apply to the video service area as a whole. For example, the 25 and 30 percent benchmarks set forth in subsection (b) simply refer to "households with access to the holder's video service;" there is no requirement that this benchmark be met within any subdivision of the providers video service territory.

AT&T California requests the Proposed Decision be clarified to indicate that non-discrimination requirements apply to the provider's video service area as a whole in its franchise territory, rather than for each non-contiguous area as the distinction between contiguous and non-contiguous area might suggest.

D. The Proposed Decision Should Be Revised To Address Proper Identification Of Partial Service Of Census Block Groups

Footnote 501 of the Proposed Decision provides,

We note that there still may be calculation issues for a company that fails to offer service in an entire census tract. No party, however, raises this issue, so we assume that state video franchise holders offer or plan to offer service only to whole census tracts, rather than portions of census tracts.¹¹

For the record, AT&T California wishes to clarify that there are instances in which AT&T California's telephone service area only partially covers a census block group. Because AT&T California will only be providing video service within its telephone footprint, AT&T California will not be providing video service throughout such a census block group. To address this issue, AT&T California proposes to include in its application a general statement that it will be

¹⁰ Unless otherwise indicated, references to statutory sections and subsections are intended to refer to the Public Utilities Code.

¹¹ Proposed Decision, p. 136, fn. 501.

providing video service only within its telephone footprint. AT&T California requests the Proposed Decision be modified to indicate that this approach is acceptable.

E. The Proposed Decision's Reporting Requirements Should Be Revised

AT&T California requests revisions to the Proposed Decision's reporting requirements, as described below.

1. Improperly Expanded Application Reporting Requirements Should Be Removed.

DIVCA carefully outlines the application process and expressly provides that “[t]he application process described in this section and the authority granted to the commission under this section *shall not exceed the provisions set forth in this section.*”¹² Thus, the only permissible application reporting requirements are those imposed by subsections 5840(e)(6), (7) and (8).¹³ However, the Proposed Decision would dramatically expand these limited requirements, and require the submission of extensive broadband, video and low-income household data.

DIVCA establishes an expeditious, streamlined, and cost-effective application process. The collection, preparation and submission of the additional data required by the Proposed

¹² Pub. Util. Code § 5840(b) (emphasis added).

¹³ Pub. Util. Code § 5840(e)(6), (7) and (8) require the submission of:

(6) A description of the video service area footprint that is proposed to be served, as identified by a collection of United States Census Bureau Block numbers (13 digit) or a geographic information system digital boundary meeting or exceeding national map accuracy standards. This description shall include the socioeconomic status information of all residents within the service area footprint.

(7) If the applicant is a telephone corporation or an affiliate of a telephone corporation, as defined in Section 234, a description of the territory in which the company provides telephone service. The description shall include socioeconomic status information of all residents within the telephone corporation's service territory.

(8) The expected date for the deployment of video service in each of the areas identified in paragraph (6).

Decision would be costly and time-consuming. Further, the additional data are not relevant to the processing of a franchise application. For these reasons, and because the additional requirements are contrary to DIVCA, the Proposed Decision should be modified to remove any application reporting requirements not expressly set forth in subsections 5840(e)(6), (7) and (8).¹⁴

2. The Proposed Requirements To Report The Number Of Video Customers And The Extent Of Use Of Other Broadband Technologies Should Be Removed.

DIVCA consistently indicates that the Commission's authority over video service is limited to that expressly granted within DIVCA;¹⁵ and DIVCA sets forth the specific reporting requirements the Commission can impose.¹⁶ DIVCA requires reporting of the number of households "offered" video service, not the number of video subscribers.¹⁷ Nonetheless, the Proposed Decision would require providers with more than 1,000,000 telephone customers to report the number of video subscribers.¹⁸ Because this requirement is contrary to DIVCA, and because the information is highly sensitive to video providers, the Proposed Decision should be modified to eliminate the requirement to report the number of video subscribers.

¹⁴ The improperly expanded application reporting requirements are specifically identified in the proposed redlines set forth in the Proposed Application, Questions 14 and 15. Even if one accepts for the purpose of discussion that the availability of broadband and video services are measures of "socioeconomic status", in California's competitive environment for both broadband and video services, requiring the Applicant to disclose publicly the number of its subscribers is not warranted nor relevant. As shown in the FCC's High-Speed Services for Internet Access as of December 31, 2005 (released July 2006), less than half of broadband subscribers in California use telephony-based DSL services.

¹⁵ See, e.g., Pub. Util. Code § 5840(a) ("Neither the commission nor any local franchising entity or other local entity of the state may require the holder of a state franchise to obtain a separate franchise *or otherwise impose any requirement* on any holder of a state franchise except as expressly provided in this division." (emphasis added)); Pub. Util. Code § 5840(b) ("The application process described in this section and *the authority granted to the commission under this section shall not exceed the provisions set forth in this section.*" (emphasis added)).

¹⁶ See, e.g., Pub. Util. Code § 5960(b).

¹⁷ Pub. Util. Code § 5960(b)(2)(A)(ii).

¹⁸ Proposed G.O., pp. 23-24.

The Proposed Decision would, moreover, require reporting of “the extent to which” broadband is provided using various technologies;¹⁹ whereas DIVCA only requires reporting of “[w]hether the broadband provided by the holder utilizes wireline-based facilities or another technology.”²⁰ DIVCA thus requires only a statement, without quantification, of whether broadband is provided by other technologies. Such a statement would be much less burdensome, and would also avoid potential ambiguities regarding how to count and compare various technologies. AT&T California requests the Proposed Decision be modified to remove the requirement to report “the extent to which” broadband is provided using other technologies.

3. Requests That Trade Secret Information Be Kept Confidential Should Be Honored

Certain information submitted with the application or otherwise reported to the Commission—including annual gross state video revenues, employment information, numbers of subscribers, and roll-out plans—likely will include trade secrets. AT&T California has significant concerns regarding submission of trade secrets to the Commission without assurance that those secrets will be properly safeguarded.

The Proposed Decision determines that annual gross state video revenue should not be accorded trade secret protection because it is public information released to the FCC.²¹ However, the Proposed Decision is in error. The video revenue-related data AT&T provides to the FCC are not separately broken out as the Proposed Decision assumes, and thus remain confidential. Annual gross state revenues are plainly proprietary and should be accorded trade secret or other confidential treatment. In determining to hold diversity information confidential

¹⁹ Proposed Decision, p. 127; *see also id.* at Appendix B, p. 22.

²⁰ Pub. Util. Code § 5960(b)(1)(C) (emphasis added).

²¹ Proposed Decision, p. 132.

and release it only on an aggregate industry basis, the Proposed Decision acknowledges the Commission's authority to hold information confidential.²²

With respect to employment information, the Proposed Decision determines it will not be treated confidentially because DIVCA requires that it be made available to the public on the Commission's website.²³ But DIVCA does not require employment information to be made public on a granular basis individually for each provider.²⁴ Although granular, provider-specific information is competitively sensitive, aggregate information including all providers is not. Accordingly, the Proposed Decision should be modified to accord granular, provider-specific employment information trade secret protection, and to publicly report only aggregate information.

More generally, AT&T California requests that the Commission expressly acknowledge in the final decision its obligation²⁵ to protect trade secrets designated by the applicant and provider, including, but not limited to, the information described above. AT&T California also requests that the Proposed Decision be clarified to state expressly that the broadband and video services data to be accorded confidential treatment include the number of video subscribers reported to the Commission.²⁶ This information is highly competitively sensitive and must be protected from public disclosure.

²² *Id.* at 146.

²³ *Id.* at 134.

²⁴ Pub. Util. Code § 5920(b).

²⁵ *See, e.g.,* Gov. Code § 6254(k) (exempting from disclosure records protected by Evidence Code); *Cal. School Employees Ass'n v. Sunnyvale Elementary School Dist. of Santa Clara County* (1973), 36 Cal.App.3d 46, 65-66 (secrets exempted from disclosure under Public Records Act); Evidence Code § 1060 (owner of trade secret privileged to refuse to disclose and prevent disclosure of the secret); Civ. Code §§ 3426 *et seq.* (Uniform Trade Secrets Act).

²⁶ Proposed Decision, p. 138.

4. The Requirement That No Alternate Geospatial Area Include More Than 1,000 Households Should Be Removed.

Appendix D to the Proposed Decision, describing technical requirements for broadband and video availability reports, allows the collection of data on the basis of “Alternate Geospatial Areas” as an alternative to census block groups so long as those areas “contain on average no more housing units than the average Current Census Block Group in California.”²⁷ AT&T California fully supports this approach because its current systems do not maintain certain relevant data by census block group, and the provision regarding averages would ensure the data provided would be no less granular. However, Appendix D would also include an inflexible limitation that the Alternate Geospatial Area be “under no circumstances...greater than 1,000 housing units.”²⁸ This arbitrary cut off is unnecessary in light of the restriction that the Alternate Geospatial Areas be no larger on average than census block groups, and could unnecessarily impair the benefits of allowing “Alternate Geospatial Areas.” Accordingly, the Proposed Decision should be modified to remove the 1,000 housing unit cut off.

F. The Proposed Decision Should Acknowledge The Commission’s Limited Enforcement Authority

As AT&T California explained in detail its Opening Comments on the Order Instituting Rulemaking, the Commission’s authority to open an investigation is limited to claims of discrimination or denial of access, as specified in section 5890.²⁹

The pertinent provision is section 5890(g), which provides in part (emphasis added):

²⁷ *Id.* at Appendix D, pp. 1-2.

²⁸ *Id.* at Appendix D, p. 2.

²⁹ This is not to suggest the Commission does not have independent authority to open investigations under other provisions of the Public Utilities Code regarding certain matters addressed by AB 2987, namely the provisions regarding increasing basic telephone rates. AT&T California is merely stating that AB 2987 itself does not provide authority to open an investigation beyond this one area.

Local governments may bring complaints to the state franchising authority that the holder is not offering video service *as required by this section* or the state franchising authority may open an investigation on its own motion.

Unquestionably, the first clause of this sentence limits local government complaints to the anti-discrimination provisions in section 5890.

The conclusion that the Commission's authority is limited to section 5890 is bolstered by where the authority to investigate is placed in the bill: in section 5890, which deals only with anti-discrimination and build requirements. This conclusion is further bolstered by where the grant of authority appears within section 5890 itself: in subsection (h) immediately after a grant of authority for cities to complain about "violations of this section" and immediately before two other subsections, (i) and (j), that provide penalties for a "violation of this section." In this full context, it is evident that the Commission's authority in this regard is limited. There is nothing in this or any other section of the bill that provides the Commission the authority to open investigations on issues outside section 5890. Accordingly, AT&T California requests the Proposed Decision be modified to reflect this limited enforcement authority.

In addition, AT&T California requests clarification of the Proposed Decision's statement that,

the Commission has the authority to suspend or revoke a state video franchise if it determines that a fact or condition exists that, if it had existed at the time of the original application for the state video franchise (or transfer or amendment thereof), reasonably would have warranted the Commission's refusal to issue the state video franchise originally (or grant the transfer or amendment thereof).³⁰

This statement could be read to authorize retroactive application, based on events or conditions occurring after the application is filed. The Commission, depending on the circumstances, might

³⁰ Proposed Decision, p. 165.

have the authority to amend or suspend an application if a fact or condition was concealed or for a violation of DIVCA, but this language goes beyond that. It should be clarified.

G. The Proposed Application Form Should Be Revised.

The Proposed Decision acknowledges the burden of compiling the socioeconomic data required in the application process by deeming that requirement satisfied “if an applicant attests in its application that it will provide us the requested socioeconomic status information within four months of filing an application.”³¹ AT&T California appreciates this flexibility and requests that it be expressly acknowledged in the proposed application form and associated affidavit.

Finally, clarification is needed regarding the Census data required as part of the application process. Appendix E of the Proposed Decision addresses the matter for the purpose of preparing reports, stating that,

projections of U.S. Census data typically are not publicly available. To produce this required demographic data, state video franchise holders shall rely on data and projections from private vendors capable of producing reliable projections based on U.S. Census data.”³²

However, the proposed application form indicates that the information to be used to report the number of low-income households is to be prepared using “public” census data,³³ which would be approximately six years old. Using six-year-old low-income data would be directly contrary to the specific language of DIVCA, which mandates that “low income” be based on census “estimates adjusted annually to reflect rates of change and distribution through January 1,

³¹ *Id.* at 53.

³² *Id.* at Appendix E, p. 1.

³³ *Id.* at Appendix B, Attachment A, pp. 6-7 (Q.14.b.iii and Q15.b.iii).

2007.”³⁴ Accordingly, AT&T California requests that the application form be clarified to provide that low-income data is to be based on census estimates adjusted annually to reflect rates of change and distribution through January 1, 2007.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, AT&T California requests that the Proposed Decision be clarified and modified as proposed herein, and in the attachments hereto.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/s/
James B. Young
David J. Miller
AT&T Services Legal Department
525 Market Street, Room 2018
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: (415) 778-1393
Fax: (281) 664-9478
davidjmiller@att.com

DATED: February 5, 2007

³⁴ Pub. Util. Code § 5890(j)(1),(2).

**OPENING COMMENTS OF AT&T CALIFORNIA
ON THE PROPOSED DECISION
OF COMMISSIONER CHONG,**

ATTACHMENT A

Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Findings of Fact

1. The Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act ("DIVCA") became effective January 1, 2007.

2. Preventing an incumbent cable operator in one service area from operating under a state video franchise in a new area would not promote widespread access to the most technologically advanced cable and video services in California.

3. The ability of a local entity to force an incumbent cable operator to agree to extra concessions during the time following the expiration of a local franchise but prior to when the incumbent may operate under a state video franchise would disadvantage incumbent cable operators over new entrants and create an unfair and unlevel playing field for market competitors.

4. Appropriate implementation of DIVCA, which is designed to create a fair and level playing field for all video service providers, requires the automatic extension of local video franchises that (i) expire before January 2, 2008 and (ii) are held by incumbent cable operators planning to seek state video franchises.

5. Failure to allow state video franchise applications in advance of the expiration of local franchises would place incumbent cable operators in legal limbo during the time between expiration of their local franchises and issuance of their state video franchises.

6. It is reasonable and consistent with DIVCA's objectives to permit incumbent cable operators to apply for state video franchises before expiration of their local franchises.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

7. Without further Commission action, the potential for evasion of statutory obligations increases through the holding of multiple state franchises via multiple entities.

8. Placing stipulations on when a video service provider is eligible to operate under a state video franchise will decrease the complexity of the application review process and reduce the potential for state video franchise holders to evade compliance with statutory obligations.

9. Stipulations placed on when a video service provider is eligible to operate under a state video franchise are relevant to implementation of statutory provisions concerning the cross-subsidization prohibition, build-out requirements and reporting obligations of DIVCA.:

10. Without further Commission action, the Commission's ability to enforce build-out requirements could be impaired if a corporate family divides its video or telephone and video services among different operating entities in California.

11. Without further Commission action, the Commission's authority and ability to prevent subsidization of video services with telecommunications funds pursuant to DIVCA could be challenged if a company divides its video and telecommunications services into two different operating entities.

12. Without further Commission action, it could be difficult, if not impossible, for the Commission to collect comprehensive broadband and video reports if a company separated its broadband operations from its video operations, or divided its video operations among multiple California entities.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

13. The proposal in R.06-10-005 to limit the award of a state video ~~franchises~~franchise- to the parent company in a corporate family would be unduly burdensome.

14. It is necessary and reasonable to condition an applicant's eligibility for a state video franchise on its stipulating in its application affidavit that it and all its affiliates' California operations will be included for the purposes of applying Public Utilities Code §§ 5840, 5890, 5960, and 5940.

15. The stipulations enumerated in Appendix C ensure that no state video franchise holder may evade DIVCA requirements due to the specific nature of its corporate structure.

16. It is reasonable to use as a definition of "affiliate" that set forth in R.92-08-008 and contained herein, because that definition is longstanding and commonly used in this forum.

17. R.92-08-008 states that "Affiliate" means any company 5 per cent or more of whose outstanding securities are owned, controlled, or held with power to vote, directly or indirectly either by a state video franchise holder or any of its subsidiaries, or by that state video franchise holder's controlling corporation and/or any of its subsidiaries as well as any company in which the state video franchise holder, its controlling corporation, or any of the state video franchise holder's affiliates exert substantial control over the operation of the company and/or indirectly have substantial financial interests in the company exercised through means other than ownership.

18. The Commission has found the definition of affiliate contained in R.92-08-008 as adequate for reporting ~~purposed~~purposes for some time.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

19. It is reasonable to allow franchise applicants to describe their proposed video service area footprint as a collection of census block groups, or as a collection of blocks defined by a geographic information system digital boundary meeting or exceeding national map accuracy standards.

20. It is reasonable to define areas in the video service footprint as collections of touching census block groups, ~~portions of census block groups~~, or regions defined by geographic information system boundaries, because this definition provides adequate information about the footprint to the Commission and comports with common understanding of an "area."

21. It is reasonable to require a video franchise applicant to provide an expected date of deployment for each area in the video service footprint pursuant to the definition adopted herein, and accordingly to require the applicant to provide an expected date of deployment for the entirety of each non-contiguous grouping or region included in its proposed video service footprint.

22. In some cases, requiring the provision of deployment data at a greater level of granularity in the application could place some applicants at a competitive disadvantage to other applicants.

23. Data contained in the franchise application ~~is~~ are ~~not~~ subject to confidentiality protections.

24. The Commission will receive deployment data at a high level of granularity through reports that a franchisee must submit. ~~This~~ These data ~~is~~ are subject to confidentiality protections consistent with Public Utilities Code § 583.

Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

25. Requiring applicants to provide deployment data in the application at a the level of detail adopted in the proposed General Order is reasonable in light of the fact that the Commission will obtain granular information through reports that are subject to confidentiality protections.

~~26. Access and subscription to advanced communication technologies are important socioeconomic indicators.~~

27.26. Broadband and video services are becoming increasingly important to active participation in our modern-day economy and society.

~~28. Restricting socioeconomic indicators to income alone focuses too narrowly on economic factors, and fails to encompass social factors.~~

29.27. DIVCA's legislative purposes include promoting widespread access to the most technologically advanced video services and closing the digital divide.

~~30. It is reasonable to require the submission of information on access and subscription to advanced communications services as part of the socioeconomic information collected pursuant to DIVCA.~~

~~31. AT&T's proposal to not define "socioeconomic indicators" would lead to confusion by applicants as to what information we expect to be filed with the Commission.~~

~~32. The diversity of parties' comments on the definition of "socioeconomic status information" demonstrates that reasonable people can disagree regarding the appropriate definition.~~

~~33. The early collection of broadband and video services information will give the Commission time to address and resolve data collection and analysis issues that arise.~~

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

~~34.~~ The first report on broadband and video services data is due July 1, 2008.

35.28. Due to the timing of data collection, requiring the submission of extensive socio-economic data simultaneously with the filing of a video franchise application, particularly for applications submitted early in a calendar year, is not reasonable.

36.29. Permitting the applicant for a video franchise to attest in its application that it will provide the Commission with the requested socioeconomic status information within four months of filing an application ensures that the Commission will have appropriate baseline information for reviewing a company's progress, but does not impose an unnecessary barrier to entry.

37.30. A four-month period for submitting socioeconomic data mirrors the amount of time allotted to state video franchise holders for their preparation of annual broadband and video reports.

38.31. It is reasonable to permit the applicant for a video franchise to attest in its application that it will provide the Commission with the requested socioeconomic status information within four months of filing an application.

39.32. It is not reasonable to deem an application incomplete when an applicant has attested that it will provide the Commission with the requested socioeconomic status information within four months of filing an application instead of in the application itself.

40.33. It is reasonable for the application to include information on all parent entities, if more than one, including the ultimate parent.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

41.34. Since the Commission is requiring the submission of a bond to provide adequate assurance that the applicant possesses the financial, legal and technical qualifications necessary to construct and operate the proposed system and promptly repair any damage to the public right-of-way caused by the applicant, it is not necessary to explain what proof of legal and technical qualifications the Commission expects of an applicant.

42.35. Coordination and exchange of information with local entities will facilitate the success of the new state video franchise system.

43.36. The staff of the Commission's new video franchise unit is the appropriate unit to develop plans to coordinate with local entities.

44.37. It serves no useful purpose to require of applicants a showing as to how they intend to meet the statute's build-out and anti-discrimination requirements; rather, the focus should be on their concrete actions, or lack thereof, as franchisees.

45.38. Monitoring the actions of a franchisee through the Commission's reporting requirements will enable the Commission to determine whether a franchisee is complying with the statute's build-out and anti-discrimination requirements and to take appropriate enforcement steps if it is not complying.

46.39. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5810(c), it is the intent of DIVCA that collective bargaining agreements be respected.

47.40. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5870(b), a transferee of a state video franchise must agree that any collective bargaining agreement entered into by a video service provider shall continue to be honored, paid, or performed to the same extent as would be required if the video service provider continued to operate under its franchise.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

48.41. To ensure the Commission is adequately informed of collective bargaining requirements when a state video franchise is transferred, it is consistent with DIVCA to require state video franchise holders to produce annual reports to ~~that~~ indicate whether their employees are subject to a collective bargaining agreement.

49.42. When transfer of a state video franchise license is sought, it is consistent with DIVCA to require a transferee to complete an affidavit that attests it will respect existing collective bargaining agreements.

50.43. The affidavit requires the affiant to swear that she or he has "personal knowledge of the facts," is "competent to testify to [the facts]," and has "authority to make this Application behalf of and to bind the Company."

51.44. It is reasonable for the Commission to impose a bond requirement to determine whether applicants possess financial, legal and technical qualifications necessary to be state video franchise holders.

52.45. The Commission's bond requirement ~~only~~ demonstrates that the applicant possesses the "qualifications" necessary to be a state video franchise holder in a proposed video service area. It does not substitute for security instruments that are typically required by a local entity as part of its oversight of local rights-of-way.

53.46. Locally required security instruments can best take into account size and scope of a state video franchise holder's local construction and operations. It would be contrary to DIVCA to grant local entities any security instrument authority in addition to the authority they already have.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

47. Unreasonable attempts by local entities to block rights-of-way access for video franchisees would risk impairing DIVCA's goal of increased investment in broadband infrastructure in order to speed the deployment of new communications and broadband infrastructure.

48. Unreasonable attempts by local entities to block rights-of-way access for video franchisees would risk impairing DIVCA's non-discrimination objectives.

49. Such unreasonable attempts by local entities to block rights-of-way access for video franchisees should not be permitted by the Commission.

54.50. A tiered bonding requirement can be sufficient to establish a state video franchise holder's qualifications without placing a significant barrier to entry on applicants that are qualified to provide video service.

55.51. It is reasonable to adopt a tiered bonding requirement for video franchise holders and to base the size of the bond on the number of a state video franchise holder's potential customers.

56.52. A requirement that state video franchise holders ~~to~~ carry a bond in the amount of \$100,000 per 20,000 households in a proposed video service area, with a required \$100,000 minimum and a cap of \$500,000 per applicant, is reasonable in light of the record of this proceeding that demonstrated a range of bonding requirements currently in use.

57.53. A cap of \$500,000 per applicant on the bond requirement will not discourage competition.

58.54. It is reasonable to require state video franchise holders to carry a bond in the amount of \$100,000 per 20,000 households in a proposed video service area, with a required \$100,000 minimum and a cap of \$500,000 per applicant on the bond requirement.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

59.55. It is reasonable to require that a corporate surety authorized to transact a surety business in California issue the franchisee's bond because the bond is to fulfill state purposes.

60.56. It is reasonable to require that the bond list the Commission as the obligee and no other obligees because the bond is designed only to prove to the state that the applicant possess adequate qualification to be a state video franchise holder and because local entities may require additional security instruments pursuant to existing authority.

61.57. It is reasonable to require that a state video franchise holder provide a copy of its executed bond with its application. It is reasonable to require that the state video franchise applicant provide a copy of this bond to affected local entities because it is part of the application.

62.58. It is not reasonable to require a state video franchise holder to provide a copy of the executed bond sixty days before it commences video system construction in a local jurisdiction because notice of the bond is provided through the receipt of a state video franchise application.

63.59. It is reasonable to require that a video franchise holder not allow its bond to lapse during any period of its operation pursuant to a state video franchise.

64.60. An application fee of \$2000 is reasonable for recovering the costs to process an application for a video franchise.

65.61. The state franchising process is ministerial and less complex than the franchising process now in place at the local level.

66.62. It is not necessary to impose additional fees to cover other tasks associated with administering the state video franchise program. Such expenses will be recovered through annual user fees.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

67.63. Since DIVCA envisions only a ministerial role for the Commission in the review of an application for a video franchise, it is not reasonable to permit protests of the application.

68.64. It would not be feasible to entertain protests, responses to protests, and Commission action to resolve the protests during the short period set by statute for the review of an application for a video franchise.

69.65. If an applicant submits a bond to demonstrate its qualifications to operate a video franchise, it is not necessary or reasonable to solicit or consider further information on the qualifications of an applicant.

70.66. It is reasonable for the Commission to provide notice of incompleteness and the specific reason for incompleteness in the same document.

71.67. It is reasonable for the Commission to provide notice of incompleteness and the specific reason for incompleteness to affected local entities as well as to the applicant.

72.68. It is reasonable for the Commission to provide notice of the statutory ineligibility of an applicant, if known, to the applicant.

73.69. It is reasonable that an application will not be deemed granted due to the Commission's failure to act when the applicant is statutorily ineligible to hold a statewide franchise under DIVCA.

74.70. Since DIVCA specifies that an incumbent cable operator's right to abrogate a local franchise is triggered when a video service provider that holds a state franchise provides notice to a local jurisdiction that it intends to initiate providing service in all or part of that jurisdiction, it is reasonable to require the state franchise holder to provide notice of

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

imminent initiation of service to the incumbent cable operators operating in that jurisdiction.

75.71. Requiring concurrent notification of the local entity and the incumbent cable operator of imminent market entry by a state franchise holder is reasonable in light of the Legislative intent that DIVCA create a fair and level playing field for all market competitors.

76.72. It is reasonable to determine and collect a user fee from state video franchise holders to finance the costs of administering the state video franchise program.

77.73. The Commission determines the utility user fee for all utilities based on revenues.

78.74. It is reasonable for the Commission to assess the user fees applicable to video franchise holders based on the revenues reported by video franchise holders.

79.75. There are significant policy and administrative benefits to harmonizing our collection of user fees across all fee payers by relying on a revenue-based system that uses the Commission's traditional payment schedule and processes.

80.76. The budget adopted by the Commission to administer the costs of the video franchising program is reasonable.

81.77. It is reasonable to base a user fee upon the percentage of all state video franchise holders' gross state video franchise revenues that is attributable to an individual state video franchise holder.

82.78. It is reasonable to determine the fee to be paid by each state video franchise holder annually.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

83.79. The payment schedule developed herein for the payment of user fees is reasonable and consistent with the Commission collection of fees from utilities.

84.80. The replacement or reduction of our annual user fee with task-specific fees is inconsistent with the procedures used to assess fees on utilities subject to Commission jurisdiction.

85.81. For Fiscal Year 2007-2008, it is not practical to assess fees based on a franchisee's revenues.

86.82. For Fiscal Year 2007-2008, it is reasonable to assess user fees based on the pro rata share of households existing in its proposed video service area as adopted by the Commission through resolution.

87.83. The procedures for collecting franchise fees for Fiscal Year 2007-2008 as discussed herein, including the requirement that all franchisees pay for an entire year, are reasonable.

88.84. Basing a user fee for Fiscal Year 2007-2008 on a state video franchise holder's potential number of subscribers best responds to the legislative intent of creating a fair and level playing field and ensuring that areas served by small video service providers are not placed at a competitive disadvantage.

89.85. Basing user fees on telephone revenues or telephone lines is not reasonable because there is no direct nexus between telephone line and the provision of video service.

90.86. The proposal to collect year 1 fees in year 2 is not reasonable because the Commission has a legal obligation to collect fees in the year in which the state has authorized spending.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

91.87. It is ~~not~~ reasonable to accord trade secret protection to information provided pursuant to the revenue reporting requirements of DIVCA ~~since this is public information and also released to the Federal Communications Commission and reported to local entities.~~

92.88. It is not reasonable to permit state franchise holders to submit user fees and data upon which the fees are based at the same time. Under the adopted fee systems, such a procedure does not permit the determination of the appropriate user fee.

93.89. The procedures for reporting, setting, and receiving user fees contained herein are reasonable and necessary to the implementation of DIVCA.

94.90. The procedures for reporting, setting, and receiving user fees closely track the user fee procedures currently used by California telecommunications carriers and should not raise novel implementation issues.

95.91. The employment reports required in General Order XX are reasonable.

96.92. It is reasonable to deem data on broadband and video availability to be collected "on a census tract basis" if a company uses a geocoding application that assigns its potential customers' addresses in the manner prescribed in Appendix D.

97.93. It is reasonable to require reports on subscriber data video availability to be based upon customers' individual addresses and geocoded to specific, corresponding census tracts or other census units that nest within census tracts.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

98.94. It is reasonable to require the reporting of broadband availability data on a census tract basis. It is reasonable to permit an approximation only if the state video franchise holder (i) does not maintain this information on a census tract basis in its normal course of business and (ii) the alternate reporting methodology reasonably approximates census tract data.

99.95. The reporting requirements pertaining to access to broadband and video services discussed herein are reasonable.

100.96. It is reasonable to release annual broadband and video data only if the Commission determines that such a disclosure of the data will be made only "as provided for pursuant to Section 583."

101.97. It is reasonable to expect that aggregated broadband and video data presented in statutorily required reports will not be competitively sensitive.

98. It is reasonable to accord granular subscriber data submitted by providers confidential treatment, as such information is highly sensitive.

102.99. The level of detail required by the Commission for the reporting of broadband and video data by franchisees is reasonable.

103.100. Since Public Utilities Code § 5890(b) establishes low-income build-out requirements that are benchmarked upon household income as of January 7, 2007, it is reasonable and useful for enforcement to require low-income household information to be reported as of January 1, 2007.

104.101. It is reasonable to define "telephone service area" as the area where the Commission has granted an entity a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

105.102. To the extent a company does not have customers in a region, the company need only collect and report publicly available U.S. Census data for that region.

106.103. The information and reports required to enforce the anti-discrimination and build-out provisions, as set forth herein, are reasonable.

107.104. Reports on video availability will allow the Commission to gauge whether a state video franchise holder has made a "substantial and continuous effort" to meet the build-out requirements established by Public Utilities Code § 5890.

105. The non-discrimination requirements of Public Utilities Code § 5890 apply to the video service area as a whole, not to any subdivision of the provider's video service territory.

108.106. It is reasonable to require state video franchise holders to submit annual reports on video service offered, both to California households generally and to low-income households specifically and on a census tract basis.

~~109. Unless information on free service to community centers, required pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890(b)(3), is reported to the Commission, there is no way for the Commission to know if the law is being adhered to.~~

~~110. The reporting requirements pertaining to the provision of free service to community centers, adopted herein, are reasonable and necessary for enforcement of specific DIVCA provisions.~~

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

~~111. Restricting public access to build-out data would unduly impede external stakeholders' ability to monitor compliance with build-out requirements.~~

~~112. It is not reasonable to give confidential treatment to build-out data.~~

113.107. Participation by state video franchise holders in Commission diversity efforts is in the public interest.

114.108. For franchise holders who decline to provide workplace diversity data equivalent to that provided by CUDC members, it is reasonable to require the state video franchise holder to provide the Commission with copies of its Employment Information Report EEO-1 (EEO-1) filings to the federal Department of Labor. An EEO-1 form is attached as Appendix G.

115.109. The filing of a copy of EEO-1 places a minimal burden on state video franchise holders.

116.110. It is reasonable to afford information provided on EEO-1 confidential treatment, releasing only aggregate video industry data at the statewide level.

~~117. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5810(a)(2), DIVCA was intended to both (a) "promote the widespread access to the most technologically advanced cable and video services" and (b) "complement efforts to increase investment in broadband infrastructure and close the digital divide," so it is reasonable to find that "free service" provided to community centers must include both broadband and video services.~~

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

118.111. It is not reasonable to impose eligibility requirements on community centers beyond those imposed in Public Utilities Code § 5890(b)(3).

119.112. The build-out requirements adopted herein that pertain to franchise holders or their affiliates with more than one million telephone customers are reasonable.

120.113. The procedures adopted herein for determining the build-out requirements that pertain to franchise holders or their affiliates with less than one million telephone customers are reasonable.

121.114. Since DIVCA's build-out requirements apply to holders of a video franchise (and not to applicants) and since DIVCA affords only thirty days for review to determine the completeness of an application, it is not reasonable to assess whether a proposed video service area is drawn in a discriminatory fashion at the time of application.

122.115. A review of a proposed video service area at the time of application is not necessary for proper enforcement of DIVCA, because local governments can bring complaints concerning discrimination to the Commission, which may open an investigation on discrimination matters at any time after the award of a video franchise.

123.116. The procedures adopted in General Order XX to extend build-out deadlines are reasonable.

124. ~~It is reasonable for the Commission to limit its initiation of investigation to issues that arise regarding franchising, anti-discrimination, reporting, the cross-subsidization prohibition, and annual user fees.~~

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

125.117. It is not reasonable for the Commission to initiate an investigation if we do not have authority to regulate in response to investigative findings.

~~126. It is reasonable for the Commission to hold public hearings whenever when franchising, anti-discrimination and build-out, reporting, cross-subsidization, or user fee provisions are at issue.~~

127.118. Under current Commission practice, an investigation typically may include evidentiary, full panel, and public participation hearings conducted in public.

128.119. It is reasonable that any investigation to determine whether an applicant failed to comply with DIVCA franchising provisions follow standard Commission proceedings for the initiation of an investigation. These procedures include a majority vote of the Commission on an order initiating the investigation that either contains a report or the declarations of Commission witnesses pertaining to facts that demonstrate an investigation of Public Utilities Code § 5890 compliance is warranted.

129.120. It is reasonable for the Commission to undertake significant monitoring for the enforcement of the anti-discrimination and build-out requirements as discussed herein.

130.121. It is reasonable to require that a complaint by a local government alleging that a state video franchise holder has failed to meet the anti-discrimination and build-out requirements of Public Utilities Code § 5890 include sworn declarations pertaining to the facts that the local government believes demonstrate a failure to fulfill obligations imposed by Public Utilities Code § 5890.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

131.122. It is reasonable that the Commission require a local entity filing a complaint to clearly identify that the complaint pertains to a failure to meet an obligation imposed by Public Utilities Code § 5890.

132.123. In any proceeding investigating a state video franchise holder's compliance with the anti-discrimination and build-out provisions of Public Utilities Code § 5890, it is reasonable to allow interested parties to petition the Commission to participate in the investigation and hearing process.

133.124. The procedures described herein for initiating and conducting a proceeding investigating allegations of a state video franchise holder's failure to comply with the anti-discrimination and build-out provisions of Public Utilities Code § 5890 are reasonable.

134.125. The procedures described herein for initiating and conducting a proceeding investigating allegations of a state video franchise holder's failure to comply with the reporting requirements of DIVCA are reasonable.

135.126. The procedures adopted herein to enforce DIVCA reporting requirements are reasonable.

136.127. The Commission has remained vigilant in enforcing existing prohibitions on unlawful cross-subsidization of intrastate telecommunications services.

137.128. The freezing of basic residential rates adopted in Public Utilities Code § 5950 ensures that there is no opportunity for basic residential rates to be increased to support video service operations during the period of the freeze.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

138.129. The Commission has reasonable requirements in place to prevent unlawful cross-subsidization of video services as discussed herein.

139.130. The procedures discussed herein for investigation and sanctioning of the unlawful cross-subsidization of video services are reasonable.

140.131. The procedures contained in GO XX for enforcing the submission of user fees are reasonable.

~~141. It is reasonable for the Commission to exercise its authority to revoke or suspend a state video franchise in response to pattern and practice of material breaches that are established by local entities or the courts.~~

~~142. The procedures for initiating and conducting a proceeding concerning whether a pattern and practice of violations of DIVCA provisions that are regulated by local entities warrant suspension or revocation of the state video franchise are reasonable.~~

~~143. In conducting a proceeding concerning whether a pattern and practice of violations of DIVCA provisions that are regulated by local entities warrant suspension or revocation of the state video franchise, it is not reasonable for the Commission to consider the merits of alleged material breaches de novo.~~

144.132. It is not clear which of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure remain applicable in a specific situation pertaining to a proceeding conducted pursuant to DIVCA.

145.133. The procedures adopted herein whereby DRA shall request reports from the Executive Director of the Commission are reasonable.

Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

146.134. It is reasonable to require state video franchise holders to submit information to DRA when the information is necessary for DRA's advocacy and enforcement actions based upon Public Utilities Code §§ 5890, 5900, and 5950.

147.135. The procedures adopted herein concerning amendments to a state video franchise are reasonable.

148.136. It is not reasonable to adopt state video franchise renewal provisions at this time.

Conclusions of Law

1. Increasing competition for video broadband services is a matter of statewide concern.
2. DIVCA directs the Commission to issue state franchises for the provision of video services in California.
3. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5810, DIVCA declares that a state video franchising process should:
 - a. Create a fair and level playing field for all market competitors that does not disadvantage or advantage one service provider or technology over another.
 - b. Promote the widespread access to the most technologically advanced cable and video services to all California communities in a nondiscriminatory manner regardless of socioeconomic status.
 - c. Protect local government revenues and their control of public rights of way.
 - d. Require market participants to comply with all applicable consumer protection laws.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

- e. Complement efforts to increase investment in broadband infrastructure and close the digital divide.
- f. Continue access to and maintenance of the public, education, and government (PEG) channels.
- g. Maintain all existing authority of the California Public Utilities Commission as established in state and federal statutes.

4. DIVCA provides that the Commission is the "sole franchising authority" for issuing state video franchises. After January 2, 2008, the Commission is the only government entity that may grant a video service provider a franchise to operate within California.

5. Pursuant to DIVCA, video service providers are not public utilities and a holder of a state franchise shall not be deemed a public utility as a result of providing video service.

6. Pursuant to DIVCA, the Commission may not impose any requirement on any holder of a state franchise except as expressly provided by DIVCA.

7. DIVCA granted local entities, not the Commission, sole authority to regulate pursuant to many statutory provisions, including franchise fee provisions (§ 5860), PEG channel requirements (§ 5870), Emergency Alert System requirements imposed by the Federal Communications Commission (§ 5880), and, notably, federal and state customer service and protection standards (§ 5900).

8. Pursuant to DIVCA, the local entity is the lead agency for any environmental review with respect to network construction, installation, and maintenance in public rights-of-way (§§ 5820 and 5885).

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

9. It would not be consistent with DIVCA for the Commission to exercise its authority in a manner that diminishes the responsibilities afforded to local entities by DIVCA.

~~10. Pursuant to DIVCA, the Commission may promulgate rules only as necessary to enforce statutory provisions on franchising (§ 5840), anti-discrimination (§ 5890), reporting (§§ 5920 and 5960), cross-subsidization prohibitions (§§ 5940 and 5950), and regulatory fees (§ 401, §§ 440-444, § 5840).~~

11.10. It would not be consistent with DIVCA for the Commission to adopt regulatory proposals that fall outside the scope of the authority specifically assigned to the Commission under DIVCA.

12.11. An incumbent cable operator should not be considered an incumbent in areas outside of its franchise service areas as of January 1, 2007.

13.12. Section 5840(n) requires a state video franchise holder to notify the local entity that the video service provider will provide video service in the local entity's jurisdiction.

14.13. Pursuant to § 5930(b) when an incumbent cable operator is providing service under an expired franchise or a franchise that expires before January 2, 2008, the local entity may extend that franchise on the same terms and conditions through January 2, 2008.

15.14. It is consistent with DIVCA to require automatic extension of local video franchises that expire before January 2, 2008 if they are held by incumbent cable operators planning to seek state video franchises.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

16.15. DIVCA seeks to create a fair and level playing field for all market competitors that does not disadvantage or advantage one service provider or technology over another.

17.16. Permitting incumbent cable operators to apply for state video franchises before expiration of their local franchises is consistent with DIVCA.

18.17. Public Utilities Code § 5840(e)(1)(B) recognizes that both “the applicant” and “its affiliates” must “comply with all federal and state statutes, rules, and regulations,” which include provisions found in DIVCA.

19.18. To ensure enforcement of DIVCA provisions cutting across communications sections, the Commission has the authority to require applicants to stipulate that it and all its affiliates’ California operations will be included for the purposes of applying Public Utilities Code §§ 5840, 5890, 5960, and 5940.

20.19. It is consistent with Public Utilities Code § 5840(f) to require an applicant to include a statement in its affidavit that it and all its affiliates’ California operations will be included for the purposes of applying Public Utilities Code §§ 5840, 5890, 5960, and 5940.

21.20. The restrictions on who may hold a state video franchise adopted herein are consistent with DIVCA.

22.21. Use of the definition of affiliate set forth in R.92-08-008 and contained herein is consistent with DIVCA and prior Commission precedent.

23.22. The definition of affiliate set forth herein is consistent with DIVCA’s statutory scheme.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

24.23. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5840(e)(6), permitting franchise applicants to describe their proposed video service area footprint as a collection of census block groups, or as a collection of blocks defined by a geographic information system digital boundary meeting or exceeding national map accuracy standards is consistent with DIVCA.

25.24. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5840(e)(6) and § 5840(e)(8), defining areas in the video service footprint as collections of touching census block groups, ~~portions of census block groups~~, or regions defined by geographic information system boundaries is consistent with DIVCA.

26.25. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5840(e)(8), requiring a video franchise applicant to provide an expected date of deployment for each area in the video service footprint pursuant to the definition proposed herein is consistent with DIVCA. The resulting provision of an expected date of deployment for the entirety of each non-contiguous grouping or region included in its proposed video service footprint is consistent with DIVCA.

~~27. DIVCA does not provide the Commission the authority to impose the confidentiality restrictions on expected deployment data submitted in the video application that AT&T and Verizon have requested. Specifically, DIVCA does not give the Commission authority to impose confidentiality restrictions on local entities regarding expected deployment dates contained in the franchise application.~~

28.26. Requiring the submission of information on access ~~and subscription~~ to advanced communications services is consistent with DIVCA and its statutory purposes.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

29.27. It is not consistent with DIVCA to require applicants to provide information in their application concerning the applicants' efforts over the last three years to help close the Digital Divide; fund access to new technology by underserved communities; demonstrate diversity at all levels of employment and management; demonstrate business opportunities created for small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses; and provide full content access to underserved and minority communities because such a requirement is inconsistent with DIVCA's application process, which sets forth requirements with particularity and strictly limits the Commission's role to determining whether the application is complete.

30.28. It is not consistent with DIVCA to require the reporting of services provided in languages other than English.

31.29. It is consistent with DIVCA to deem an application that contains an attestation that the applicant will submit socioeconomic data, including data on access and subscription to advanced communications services, as equivalent to an application that contains the data. Including such an attestation does not constitute grounds for deeming the application incomplete.

32.30. As amended pursuant to the discussion herein, the application form and the affidavits are consistent with DIVCA.

33.31. Public Utilities Code § 5840(e)(9) permits the Commission to require a bond to establish an applicant for a video franchise possesses the financial, legal, and technical qualifications necessary to construct and operate the proposed system and promptly repair any damage to the public right-of-way caused by the applicant.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

34.32. California Public Utilities Code § 58940(e)(1)(C) tasks local entities with governing the “time, place and manner” of a state video franchise holder’s use of the local rights-of-way.

~~35. DIVCA does not preclude local permits from requiring further security instruments to ensure that a state video franchise holder fulfills locally regulated obligations.~~

36.33. The requirement to name the Commission as an obligee of the bond and the requirement that the franchise applicant submit a copy of the bond as part of the application is consistent with DIVCA.

37.34. DIVCA goes not permit the submission of a financial statement in lieu of a bond to demonstrate that an applicant is qualified to hold a state video franchise.

38.35. An application fee of \$2,000 is consistent with DIVCA.

39.36. If the workload related to the application review process differs from current Commission estimates, the Commission has the statutory authority to revise its calculation of the application fee and change the fee.

40.37. DIVCA does not provide authority to collect fees for other Commission franchise actions.

41.38. Public Utilities Code § 5840 directs that the Commission’s authority to oversee the state video franchise application process shall not exceed the provisions set forth in that section.

42.39. Public Utilities Code § 5840 provides the Commission with authority to evaluate whether a state video franchise is complete or incomplete. This is a purely ministerial role.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

43.40. Public Utilities Code § 5840 provides that the Commission must inform an applicant of whether its state video franchise application is complete within thirty calendar days of receipt of its application.

44.41. DIVCA provides the Commission with no discretion over the substance or timing of its review of applications for a video franchise. The substance of the Commission's review is limited to the ministerial task of determining whether the application is complete.

45.42. DIVCA requires the Commission to issue a franchise when the application is complete before the 14th day after that finding.

46.43. The only stated ground for rejecting an application is incompleteness.

47.44. If an application is incomplete, the Commission must explain with particularity how and the applicant has an opportunity to amend the application to overcome the defects.

48.45. Public Utilities Code § 5840 does not provide for protests.

49.46. The protest of a ministerial act would be an idle act and could accomplish nothing.

50.47. DIVCA provides for a short review period for applications for a video franchise. The Commission must notify an applicant within thirty days if an application is complete.

51.48. The failure of the Commission to act on an application within 44 days of its receipt is deemed to constitute issuance of the certificate applied for and requires no further action on behalf of the applicant.

52.49. An amended application must be reviewed for completeness within thirty days of submission.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

53.50. There is no statutory basis for TURN's assertion that DRA has a right to protest an application for a video franchise.

54.51. TURN and Joint Cities misconstrue DIVCA when they assert that Public Utilities Code § 5840(e)(1)(D) permits local entities to file protests. It only requires that local entities receive a copy of the application for a state franchise.

55.52. The requirement of a bond provides adequate assurance that an applicant possesses the necessary qualifications for a video franchise.

56.53. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5840(h), notification of the affected local entities of whether the applicant's application is complete or incomplete and the particular items that are incomplete is consistent with DIVCA.

57.54. DIVCA establishes that no person or corporation shall be eligible for a new or renewed state video franchise if that person or corporation is in violation of any final nonappealable order relating to either the Cable Television and Video Providers Customer Service and Information Act or the Video Customer Service Act.

58.55. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5840(b), a state video franchise holder must provide a local entity notice that it will begin offering service in the entity's jurisdiction. This notice of imminent market entry shall be given at least 10 days but no more than 60 days, before the video service provide begins to offer service.

59.56. Implicit in the incumbent cable operator's right to abrogate its franchise with the local entity is the assumption that an incumbent cable operator will know when a state video franchise holder provides notice of imminent market entry.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

60.57. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5810(a)(2)(A), the Commission should place all user fees into a subaccount of the Commission Utilities Reimbursement Account.

61.58. The user fees assessed by the Commission on video franchise holders are not “franchise fees” as defined by Section 542 of the Federal Communications Act.

62.59. Fees levied by the Commission pursuant to DIVCA are either fees of “general applicability” or fees incidental to the awarding or enforcing the franchise.

63.60. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 401(b), the user fee shall *produce enough, and only enough, revenues to fund the commission* with (1) its authorized expenditures for each fiscal year to regulate . . . applicants and holders of a state franchise to be a video service provider, less the amount to be paid from special accounts except those established by this article, reimbursements, federal funds, and the unencumbered balance from the preceding year; (2) an appropriate reserve; and (3) any adjustment appropriated by the Legislature.

64.61. The user fee should include funding for DRA, whose budget is included in the Commission budget.

65.62. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5810(a)(3), the collection of any fees from video franchise holders in the same manner and under the same terms as it collects fees from public utilities is consistent with DIVCA.

66.63. Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code § 5810(a)(3), any user fees levied by the Commission should not discriminate against video service providers or their subscribers.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

67.64. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code §442(e), the Commission should issue refunds if it collects a fee in error.

68.65. The methodology and procedures for assessing a user fee for Fiscal Year 2007-2008 are consistent with DIVCA.

69.66. The methodology and procedures for assessing a user fees for Fiscal Years following Fiscal Year 2007-2008 are consistent with DIVCA.

70.67. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 443(a), the Commission has the authority to require a video service provider to furnish information and reports needed to assess a user fee.

71.68. Public Utilities Code § 5920 imposes specific employment reporting requirements that direct state video franchise holders with more than 750 California employees to report upon the number and types of jobs held by their employees in California.

72.69. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5920, state video franchise holders must provide projections of new hires expected an upcoming year.

~~73. Granting confidential treatment to aggregate employment data provided pursuant to DIVCA would violate the express language of Public Utilities Code § 5920(b), which requires the Commission to make the employment data available to the public on its Internet Web site.~~

70. Granular, provider-specific employment data are not required to be made publicly available by Public Utilities Code § 5920(b); it is reasonable to afford such granular information confidential treatment.

~~74. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5960, state video franchise holders must submit detailed annual reports on broadband and video services.~~

Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

~~75. The reporting requirements pertaining to broadband and video services adopted in General Order XX are consistent with DIVCA and fulfill a variety of statutory purposes. In addition to enabling the Commission to monitor build-out, the reports can enable the Commission to support voluntary efforts to increase broadband adoption.~~

~~76.71.~~ The procedures for reporting information on video availability contained in General Order XX, including the reporting methodology contained in Appendix D, are consistent with the provisions of DIVCA.

~~77.72.~~ The procedures for reporting subscriberhip video availability data contained in General Order XX and discussed herein are consistent with the provisions of DIVCA.

~~78.73.~~ Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5960(B)(1)(A), a state video franchise holder may elect to approximate data reported on a census tract basis only if the state video franchise holder (i) “does not maintain this information on a census tract basis in its normal course of business” and (ii) the alternate reporting methodology “reasonably approximate[s]” census tract data.

~~79.74.~~ Pursuant to Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5960(d), annual broadband and video data reported to the Commission shall be disclosed to the public only as provided for pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 583.

~~80. Scaling back~~The broadband reporting requirements, as proposed by AT&T reflect, contravenes the principles underlying DIVCA, including its goals to promote the widespread access to the most technologically advanced cable and video services to all California communities and to complement efforts to increase investment in broadband infrastructure.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

81.75. Requiring further broadband reporting requirements, as proposed by CCTPG/LIF, lacks a statutory basis. CCTPG/LIF does not establish that ~~this~~ these data ~~is~~ are necessary for our enforcement of specific DIVCA provisions.

82.76. Requiring the reporting of low-income household information as of January 1, 2007 is consistent with the definition of low-income household found in Public Utilities Code § 5890(j)(2).

83.77. Public Utilities Code § 5890(b) establishes low-income build out requirements that are benchmarked upon household income as of January 1, 2007.

~~84. The reporting requirements pertaining to the provision of free service to community centers, adopted herein, are consistent with the enforcement of specific DIVCA provisions.~~

~~—Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890(b)(3), the community center reporting requirement should apply to state video franchise holders with more than one million telephone subscribers.~~

85.78. The submission of information pertaining to employment, such as CUDC information or EEO-1 forms, is consistent with DIVCA's interest in tracking new employment.

86.79. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890, the Legislature required certain state video franchise holders to offer video service to California consumers within predetermined time periods.

87.80. Build-out provisions in subsections (b)(1)-(2) and (e) of Public Utilities Code § 5890 clearly require the holders of a video franchise with more than one million telephone customers to (i) offer service to a certain percentage of households in their telephone service areas in a designated

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

time period, depending on the technology used by the holders and

(ii) ensure that a certain percentage of households offered video access are “low-income households.”

88.81. Public Utilities Code § 5890(j)(2) defines a low-income household as one with an annual household income of less than \$35,000.

89.82. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890(b)(3), the holders of a video franchise with more than one million telephone customers must provide free service to community centers at the ratio of one per community center per 10,000 customers.

90.83. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890(b)(3), a community center eligible for free service must be a facility that (i) qualifies for the California Teleconnect Fund, (ii) makes the state video franchise holder's service available to the community, and (iii) only receives service from one state video franchise holder at a time.

91.84. The build-out requirements adopted herein that pertain to state video franchise holders or their affiliates with more than one million telephone customers are consistent with DIVCA.

92.85. Pursuant to DIVCA, the design of build-out requirements that pertain to franchise holders or their affiliates with less than one million telephone customers is a fact-specific endeavor.

93.86. The procedures adopted herein for determining the build-out requirements that pertain to state video franchise holders or their affiliates with less than one million telephone customers are consistent with DIVCA.

94.87. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890(d), “[w]hen “a holder provides video service outside of its telephone service area, is not a telephone corporation, or offers video service in an area where no other

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

video service is being offered, other than direct-to-home satellite service, there is a rebuttable presumption that discrimination in providing service has not occurred within those areas.”

95.88. If not rebutted, the existence of any one of the three factors listed in the prior ~~Finding of Fact~~ Conclusion of Law is sufficient to prove that a state video franchise holder is not discriminating in its provision of video service.

96.89. It is consistent with Public Utilities Code § 5890(d), which applies non-discrimination provisions to a “holder” rather than an “applicant,” that the Commission’s review of the anti-discrimination and build-out provisions take place after a state video franchise is awarded.

90. DIVCA’s non-discrimination requirements apply to the franchised provider’s service area as a whole, not on a per-contiguous-area basis.

97.91. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890(g), local governments may bring complaints concerning discrimination to the Commission for resolution and the Commission itself may open investigations on discrimination matters.

98.92. Public Utilities Code § 5890(e)(2)-(3) establishes automatic extensions for build-out requirements imposed by Public Utilities Code § 5890(e)(1)-(2). These extensions go into effect if a significant percentage of households fail to subscribe to a state video franchise holder’s service.

99.93. Public Utilities Code § 5890(f) affords the Commission discretionary authority to grant an extension for the build-out requirements imposed in subsections (b), (c), and (e).

100.94. The procedures adopted in General Order XX to extend build-out deadlines are consistent with DIVCA.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

~~101.~~95. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890(g), we conclude that the Commission may suspend or revoke a state video franchise if it finds any of the following: (a) The state video franchise holder has failed to comply with any demand, ruling, or requirement of the Commission made pursuant to and within the authority of Division 2.5; (b) The state video franchise holder has violated any provision of Division 2.5 or any rule or regulation made by the Commission under and within the authority of this division; or (c) A fact or condition previously concealed by the franchise holder is found to exists that, if it had been know to existed at the time of the original application for the state franchise (or transfer thereof), reasonably would have warranted the Commission's refusal to issue the state video franchise originally (or grant the transfer thereof).

~~102.~~96. DIVCA expressly limits the Commission's use of enforcement actions, such as investigations.

~~103.~~97. Pursuant to DIVCA, the Commission may impose a fine only when a state video franchise holder is in violation of user fee or antidiscrimination/build-out provisions.

~~104.~~98. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890, the Commission is given authority to address local entities' formal complaints based on DIVCA only when the complaints arise under Public Utilities Code § 5890.

~~105.~~99. It is consistent with DIVCA for the Commission to limit its initiation of investigations to those situations where DIVCA explicitly assigns the Commission authority to regulate.

~~106.~~100. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890(g), the Commission has the flexibility to determine which type of public hearing could best develop the record needed for deciding an individual matter.

Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

~~107. Pursuant to (i) our general enforcement powers in Public Utilities Code § 5890(g) and (ii) our specific authority to administer the state video franchise application process pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5840, the Commission has the authority to investigate allegations that a fact or condition previously concealed by the franchise holder is found to exists that, if it had been known to existed at the time of the original application for the state video franchise (or transfer or amendment thereof), reasonably would have warranted the Commission's refusal to issue the state video franchise originally (or grant the transfer or amendment thereof).~~

~~108. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890(g), the Commission may open an investigation to determine whether an applicant failed to comply with DIVCA franchising provisions.~~

~~109-101.~~ It is consistent with DIVCA to require that any investigation to determine whether an applicant failed to comply with DIVCA franchising provisions follow standard Commission proceedings for the initiation of an investigation. These procedures include a majority vote of the Commission on an order initiating the investigation that either contains a report or the declarations of Commission witnesses pertaining to facts that demonstrate an investigation of Public Utilities Code § 5890 compliance is warranted.

~~110. Pursuant to DIVCA, formal investigation of antidiscrimination and build-out compliance may be launched in two ways: (i) in response to a complaint filed by a local government, or (ii) on the Commission's own motion.~~

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

111.102. The procedures and requirements discussed herein concerning complaints filed by local governments alleging the failure of a state video franchise holder to comply with the provisions of Public Utilities Code § 5890 concerning the anti-discrimination and build-out requirements are consistent with DIVCA.

~~112. The procedures and requirements discussed herein concerning investigations initiated by the Commission alleging the failure of a state video franchise holder to comply with the provisions of Public Utilities Code § 5890 concerning the anti-discrimination and build-out requirements are consistent with DIVCA.~~

113.103. The failure to comply with the anti-discrimination and build-provision of Public Utilities Code § 5890 may subject the franchisee to multiple penalties, including fines, suspension of a video franchise, and/or revocation of a video franchise.

114.104. Pursuant to DIVCA, it is unlawful for any applicant or state video franchise holder willfully to make any untrue statement of a material fact in any application, notice, or report filed with the Commission.

115.105. Pursuant to DIVCA, it is unlawful for any applicant or state video franchise holder willfully to omit to state in any such application, notice, or report any material fact that is required to be stated by DIVCA.

~~116. Consistent with DIVCA, a formal investigation into compliance with reporting requirements may be launched (i) on the Commission's own motion or (ii) initiated in response to a complaint filed by a local government if the reporting requirement at issue is used to monitor compliance with Public Utilities Code § 5890.~~

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

117.106. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 444(a), the Commission may impose a penalty for failure to provide financial reports required by the Commission. In particular, the Commission may assess a penalty not to exceed 25 percent of the amount of a state video franchise holder's estimated user fee, on account of the failure, refusal, or neglect to prepare and submit the report required by Public Utilities Code § 443.

~~118. Pursuant to DIVCA, the Commission may fine a state video franchise holder if it fails to provide accurate reports needed to enforce anti-discrimination and build-out provisions.~~

~~119. The authority to impose penalties pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5890(g) flows to instances where a state video franchise holder misstates or omits information required by Public Utilities Code § 5960.~~

120.107. Current federal and state law subject California telecommunications companies to a variety of measures designed to prevent unlawful cross-subsidization between telecommunications costs and non-telecommunications costs.

121.108. As discussed herein, the Commission has ample authority to investigate allegations of unlawful cross-subsidization.

122.109. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5950, the Commission prohibits incumbent local exchange carriers that obtain a state video franchise from changing any rate for basic telephone service until January 1, 2009, unless the incumbent is subject to rate-of-return regulation.

123.110. The procedures discussed herein for investigation and sanctioning of the unlawful cross-subsidization of video services are consistent with DIVCA.

**Attachment A: AT&T California's Proposed Revisions
to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

124.111. The procedures contained in GO XX for enforcing the submission of user fees are consistent with DIVCA.

125.112. DIVCA explicitly empowers local entities to enforce its consumer protection provisions.

126.113. DIVCA limits the Commission's role in enforcement of consumer protection provisions.

~~127. The procedures discussed herein in determining whether to initiate a proceeding to determine whether a pattern and practice of violating consumer protection laws warrants suspension or revocation of a video franchise are consistent with DIVCA.~~

128.114. It is necessary to ensure that the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure are consistent with DIVCA.

129.115. DIVCA limits DRA's role to advocacy and enforcement actions related to Public Utilities Code §§ 5890, 5900, and 5950.

130.116. DIVCA provides that DRA may have access to information in the Commission's possession "for this purpose" of enforcing the Code sections listed in the preceding Conclusion of Law.

131.117. The procedures adopted herein whereby DRA shall request reports from the Executive Director of the Commission are consistent with DIVCA.

132.118. DIVCA does not permit the Commission to order a grant of intervenor compensation.

133.119. The procedures adopted herein concerning amendments to a video franchise are consistent with DIVCA.

134.120. Federal and state law may change between now and 2017, the earliest a state video franchise may be renewed.

**OPENING COMMENTS OF AT&T CALIFORNIA
ON THE PROPOSED DECISION
OF COMMISSIONER CHONG,**

ATTACHMENT B

Appendix B

General Order XXX Implementing The Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006 (DIVCA)

Table of Contents

	Title	Page
I.	Definitions.....	3
II.	Purpose of the General Order	6
III.	When Various Applicants Can/Must Apply for a State Video Franchise	7
	A. The Commission’s Role in Processing Applications.....	7
	B. Applications for New Franchises.....	8
	C. Applicants with Existing Franchises.....	8
	1. Eligibility Conditions.....	8
	2. Franchise Effectiveness Date.....	8
	3. Terms of Service Offered.....	9
	4. Effect of a New Competitor’s Entry into a Video Market.....	9
	5. Exception for a Party to a Stipulation and Consent Judgment Approved by a Federal District Court	10 <u>10109</u>
IV.	Application Process for a State Video Franchise.....	10
	A. Steps for Obtaining a State Video Franchise	10
	1. Step 1: Complete the Application for a State Video Franchise (Appendix A to the General Order)	10
	a) Adequate Assurance of Financial, Legal, and Technical Qualifications. 10	
	b) Application Fee.....	11
	2. Step 2: Application Submission Requirements.....	11
	a) Submit Completed Application to the Commission	11
	b) Concurrently Deliver a Copy of the Application to the Affected Local Entity.....	11
	3. Step 3: Commission Review of the Application for Completeness.....	11
	4. Step 4: Notification Regarding Application Status.....	12 <u>121211</u>
	5. Step 5: State Video Franchise Issued for Complete Applications	12
	B. Failure of Commission to Act on Application.....	13
	C. Protests to State Video Franchise Applications Disallowed.....	13
V.	Ineligibility of Entities in Violation of the Cable Television and Video Providers Service and Information Act or the Video Customer Service Act.....	13
VI.	The State Video Franchise – Authorization to Offer Service, Obligations, Amendment, Transfer, Voluntary Termination, and Miscellaneous Changes	13
	A. Authorization to Offer Service.....	13

1.	Grants of Authority	141414 13
2.	Duration of a State Video Franchise	14
B.	State Video Franchise Obligations	14
1.	Obligations Imposed by Statute	14
C.	Amending a State Video Franchise	15
1.	Fee for Amending a State Video Franchise	15
2.	Procedures for Filing a Supplemental Application	15
3.	Commission Review and Issuance of a Supplemental Application	15
D.	Transfer of a State Video Franchise	16
E.	Voluntary Termination of a State Video Franchise	17
F.	Miscellaneous Changes	17
VII.	Reporting Requirements	18
A.	Reports for Collection of the User Fee	18
B.	Annual Employment Reports	191919 18
1.	Reporting Obligations Imposed on State Video Franchise Holders with More than 750 California Employees	19
2.	Commission Reports to Legislative Committees	20
C.	Annual Reports on Broadband and Video Services	21
D.	Information on Service to Community Centers	232324 23
E.	Annual Reports on Collective Bargaining	24
G.	Workplace Diversity Reports	24
F.	Additional Information	242425 24

Appendix A Application

Appendix B Video Franchise Certificate

I. Definitions

- A. “Affiliate” means any company 5 per cent or more of whose outstanding securities are owned, controlled, or held with power to vote, directly or indirectly either by a state video franchise holder or any of its subsidiaries, or by that state video franchise holder’s controlling corporation and/or any of its subsidiaries as well as any company in which the state video franchise holder, its controlling corporation, or any of the state video franchise holder’s affiliates exert substantial control over the operation of the company and/or indirectly have substantial financial interests in the company exercised through means other than ownership.
- B. “Applicant” means any person or entity that files an Application seeking to provide Video Service in the state pursuant to a State Video Franchise.
- C. “Application” means the form prescribed by the Commission for seeking a grant or amendment of a State Video Franchise.
- D. “Application Fee” means any fee that the Commission imposes to recover its actual and reasonable costs of processing an Application.¹
- E. “Broadband” or “Broadband Service” means any service defined as broadband, or having advanced telecommunications capability, in the most recent Federal Communications Commission inquiry pursuant to Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-104).²

¹ CAL. PUB. UTIL. CODE § 5840(c). This fee is not levied for general revenue purposes, consistent with Public Utilities Code § 5840(c).

² Id. at § 5830(a). The Federal Communications Commission currently uses the term “broadband” and “advanced telecommunications capability” to describe services and facilities with an upstream (customer-to-provider) and downstream (provider-to-customer) transmission speed of more than 200 kilobits per second. FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, AVAILABILITY OF ADVANCED TELECOMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY IN THE UNITED STATES, FOURTH REPORT TO CONGRESS, FCC 04-208, 10 (Sept. 9,

- F. "Census Tract" has the same meaning as used by the U.S. Census Bureau.³
- G. "Commission" means the Public Utilities Commission.
- H. "Community Center" means any facility run by an organization that has qualified for the California Teleconnect Fund, as established in Public Utilities Code § 280, and that will make the State Video Franchise Holder's service available to the community.⁴
- I. "DIVCA" means the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006 (Ch. 700, Stats. 2006).⁵
- J. "DRA" means the Division of Ratepayer Advocates.
- K. "Effective Date of this General Order" means January 2, 2007 or the date when this Order is adopted, whichever is later.
- L. "Household" means, consistent with the U.S. Census Bureau, a house, apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is intended for occupancy as separate living quarters.⁶ Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live and eat separately from any other persons in building and which have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall.⁷
- M. "Incumbent Cable Operator" means a cable operator or open-video system serving subscribers under a franchise in

2004). This definition, however, is under review by the Commission, and it may evolve in response to rapid technological changes in the marketplace. Id.

³ CAL. PUB. UTIL. CODE at § 5960(a).

⁴ Id. at § 5890(b)(3).

⁵ In this General Order, all further references to Public Utilities Code are to those sections adopted or amended in DIVCA.

⁶ Id. at § 5890(j)(1).

⁷ Id.

a particular city, county, or city and county franchise area on January 1, 2007.⁸

- N. “Local Entity” means any city, county, city and county, or joint powers authority within the state within whose jurisdiction a State Video Franchise Holder may provide Video Service.⁹
- O. “Low-Income Household” means a residential Household where the average annual Household income is less than \$35,000, as based on U.S. Census Bureau estimates adjusted annually to reflect rates of change and distribution through January 1, 2007.¹⁰
- P. “State Video Franchise” means a franchise issued pursuant to DIVCA.¹¹
- Q. “State Video Franchise Holder” means a person or group of persons that has been issued a State Video Franchise from the Commission pursuant to Division 2.5 of DIVCA.¹²
- R. “Telephone Service Area” means the area where the Commission has granted an entity a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to provide telephone service.
- S. “Telephone Corporation” means a telephone corporation as defined in Public Utilities Code § 234.
- T. “User Fee” means the fee paid to the Commission quarterly by each Holder pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 442(a).
- U. “Video Service” means video programming services, cable service, or open-video system service provided through facilities located at least in part in public rights-of-way

⁸ Id. at § 5830(j).

⁹ Id. at § 5830(k).

¹⁰ Id. at § 5890(j)(2) (defining “low-income households” for the purposes of imposing build-out requirements).

¹¹ Id. at § 5830(p).

¹² Id. at § 5830(i).

without regard to delivery technology, including Internet protocol or other technology. This definition does not include (1) any video programming provided by a commercial mobile service provider defined in Section 322(d) of Title 47 of the United States Code, or (2) video programming provided as part of, and via, a service that enables users to access content, information, electronic mail, or other services offered over the public Internet.¹³

- V. “Video Service Area” means the area proposed to be served under a State Video Franchise.
- W. “Video Service Provider” means any entity providing Video Service.¹⁴

II. Purpose of the General Order

The purpose of this General Order is to promulgate the rules necessary to implement Assembly Bill (AB) 2987, the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006 (DIVCA), which was signed into law by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on September 29, 2006. In enacting this Order, we remain mindful of the fact that the Legislature intends for the state video franchising process to achieve the following objectives:

- A. Create a fair and level playing field for all market participants that does not disadvantage or advantage one service provider or technology over another;
- B. Promote the widespread access to the most technologically advanced cable and video services to all California communities in a nondiscriminatory manner, regardless of their socioeconomic status;
- C. Protect local government revenues and control of public rights-of-way;
- D. Require Video Service Providers to comply with all applicable consumer protection laws;

¹³ Id. at § 5830(s).

¹⁴ Id. at § 5830(t).

- E. Complement efforts to increase investment in Broadband infrastructure and close the digital divide;
- F. Continue access to and maintenance of public, education, and government (PEG) channels; and
- G. Maintain all existing authority of the Commission as established by state and federal statutes.¹⁵

This Commission will act to bring these intended economic and social benefits of Video Service competition to California.

We also recognize that the Legislature found that the public interest is best served when sufficient funds are appropriated to the Commission to provide adequate staff and resources to appropriately and timely process applications of Video Service Providers and to ensure full compliance with the requirements of Division 2.5 of the Public Utilities Code.¹⁶ Accordingly, the General Order assesses fees that will ensure that our video franchising operations are adequately funded and staffed.

III. When Various Applicants Can/Must Apply for a State Video Franchise

A. The Commission's Role in Processing Applications

The Commission shall begin accepting Applications for State Video Franchises on the Effective Date of this General Order.¹⁷ Between the Effective Date of this General Order and January 1, 2008, persons wishing to offer Video Service in an area where a local franchise has not already been granted to that person may seek a State Video Franchise from the Commission or a local franchise from the local franchising authority.

After January 1, 2008, the Commission shall be the sole franchising authority for new Video Service franchises in the state of California.¹⁸

¹⁵ CAL. PUB. UTIL. CODE §§ 5810(2)(A)-(G).

¹⁶ Id. at § 401(a).

¹⁷ See id. at § 5840(g) (ordering the Commission to commence accepting Applications for a State Video Franchise no later than April 1, 2007).

¹⁸ Id. at §§ 5840(c),(g).

After January 1, 2008, any person or corporation that seeks to provide Video Service for which a franchise has not already been issued shall file an Application for a State Video Franchise with the Commission.¹⁹

B. Applications for New Franchises

To facilitate Commission design of build-out requirements, any Applicant that alone or together with its Affiliates has fewer than 1,000,000 telephone customers shall provide the Commission written notice of its intent to apply for a State Video Franchise within three months of its expected Application date.

An Applicant shall not be considered an “Incumbent Cable Operator” for the purpose of an Application if the Application is for an area in which the Applicant did not have a local franchise granted as of January 1, 2007.

Applications for State Video Franchise in areas where a franchise has not already been granted to that Applicant may be submitted on or after the Effective Date of this General Order.²⁰

C. Applicants with Existing Franchises

1. Eligibility Conditions

Incumbent Cable Operators are not eligible to apply for a State Video Franchise for the same service area covered by their local franchise unless at least one of the following three conditions applies: (i) the local franchise expires prior to its renewal or extension; (ii) the Applicant and the local franchising authority mutually agree to terminate the local franchise, and submit their agreement in writing to the Commission; or (iii) a Video Service or cable provider with a State Video Franchise notifies the Local Entity and Incumbent Cable Operators of its intent to begin offering Video Service in all or part of the Local Entity’s jurisdiction.²¹

2. Franchise Effectiveness Date

Unless at least one of the three conditions outlined in C.1 above is met, In
no case shall a State Video Franchise shall not be issued to an Incumbent Cable
Operator for a service area in which it has an existing local franchise ~~become~~

¹⁹ Id. at § 5840(c).

²⁰ Id. at § 5840(g).

²¹ Id. at § 5840(o).

effective prior to January 2, 2008.²² Prior to January 2, 2008, an Incumbent Cable Operator with an expired or expiring franchise may choose to renew the local franchise or seek a State Video Franchise. If an Incumbent Cable Operator's franchise expires before January 2, 2008, it can apply for a State Video Franchise that begins on January 2, 2008. If a State Video Franchise is sought, the local franchise shall be extended under its existing terms until the State Video Franchise is effective.²³

3. Terms of Service Offered

An Incumbent Cable Operator that chooses to replace its local franchise with a State Video Franchise shall continue to serve all areas as required by its local franchise agreement existing on January 1, 2007, until that local franchise otherwise would, under its terms, have expired.²⁴

An Incumbent Cable Operator that is also a Telephone Corporation with less than 1,000,000 telephone customers in California and is providing video service in competition with another Incumbent Cable Operator shall be required to continue providing Video Service only in the areas in which it provided Video Service as of January 1, 2007.²⁵

4. Effect of a New Competitor's Entry into a Video Market

When a Video Service Provider that holds a State Video Franchise provides the notice required pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 5840(m) to a Local Entity, the Local Entity may require Incumbent Cable Operators to seek a State Video Franchise.²⁶ The Local Entity shall terminate the local franchise when the Commission issues a State Video Franchise to the Video Service Provider that includes the entire service area served by the Video Service Provider and the Video Service Provider gives notice to the Local Entity that it will begin providing service in that area under a State Video Franchise.

²² Id. at § 5930(b).

²³ Id. at § 5930(b).

²⁴ Id. at § 5840(p).

²⁵ Id. at § 5840(p).

²⁶ Id. at § 5930(c).

5. Exception for a Party to a Stipulation and Consent Judgment Approved by a Federal District Court

Any Video Service Provider that currently holds a franchise with a local franchising entity in a county that is a party, either alone or in conjunction with any other local franchising entity located in that county, to a stipulation and consent judgment executed by the parties thereto and approved by a federal district court shall neither be entitled to seek a State Video Franchise in any area of that county, including any unincorporated area and any incorporated city of that county, nor abrogate any existing franchise before July 1, 2014. Prior to July 1, 2014, the Video Service Provider shall continue to be exclusively governed by any existing franchise with a local franchising entity for the term of that franchise and any and all issues relating to renewal, transfer, or otherwise in relation to that franchise shall be resolved pursuant to that existing franchise and otherwise applicable federal and local law. This rule shall not be deemed to extend any existing franchise beyond its term.²⁷

IV. Application Process for a State Video Franchise

A. Steps for Obtaining a State Video Franchise

1. Step 1: Complete the Application for a State Video Franchise²⁸ (Appendix A to the General Order)

The Application shall include all information required by Public Utilities Code § 5840(e), as well as information required to ascertain an Applicant's eligibility requirements, as described in Public Utilities Code §§ 5840(c), 5840(d), 5840(f), 5840(o), 5840(p), 5930(a), 5930(b), and 5930(c).

a) Adequate Assurance of Financial, Legal, and Technical Qualifications

An Applicant is required to provide adequate assurance that it possesses the financial, legal, and technical qualifications necessary to construct and operate the proposed system and promptly repair any damage to the public right-of-way caused by the Applicant.²⁹ To meet this requirement, the Applicant shall submit

²⁷ Id. at § 5930(a).

²⁸ Id. at § 5840(e).

²⁹ Id. at § 5840(e)(9).

a copy of a fully executed bond in the amount of \$100,000 per 20,000 households in its proposed video service area. The amount of the bond under any circumstances shall not be less than \$100,000 or more than \$500,000 per Applicant. The bond shall list the Commission as obligee and be issued by a corporate surety authorized to transact a surety business in California.

b) Application Fee

Upon filing its initial Application, an Applicant is required to pay an Application Fee in the amount of \$2,000 to the Commission. This fee does not exceed the actual and reasonable costs of processing an Application.³⁰

2. Step 2: Application Submission Requirements

a) Submit Completed Application to the Commission³¹

The Commission requires all Applicants to submit Applications in the format – paper or electronic – that the Commission directs. In all cases, the Applicant must complete the attached affidavit, submitting one paper original and one paper copy to the Commission’s Docket Office.

b) Concurrently Deliver a Copy of the Application to the Affected Local Entity

An Applicant shall concurrently deliver a copy of its Application to the appropriate contact person for each Local Entity where the Applicant will provide service.³²

3. Step 3: Commission Review of the Application for Completeness

The Commission shall review the Application and determine whether the Application is complete or incomplete before the thirtieth calendar day after the Applicant submits the Application.³³

³⁰ Id. at § 5840(c).

³¹ Id. at § 5840(a).

³² Id. at § 5840(e)(1)(D).

³³ Id. at § 5840(h)(1).

4. Step 4: Notification Regarding Application Status

The Commission, acting through the Executive Director, shall notify the Applicant and affected Local Entities³⁴ as to whether the Application is complete or incomplete before the thirtieth calendar day after the Applicant submits the Application.³⁵

The Commission's notice of a complete Application will include notification that the Commission shall issue a State Video Franchise before the fourteenth calendar day after the determination of completeness was made.³⁶

The Commission's notice of an incomplete Application to Applicants and affected Local Entities will include a statement specifying with particularity which items are incomplete and a statement permitting the Applicant to amend the Application.³⁷ There is no fee associated with such amendments.

The Commission shall have 30 calendar days from the date an incomplete Application is amended and submitted to the Commission to determine its completeness.³⁸

Notice of complete and incomplete amended Applications and review of subsequent incomplete amended Applications shall follow the procedures outlined in Steps 3 and 4 above.

If an Applicant is statutorily ineligible for a State Issued Franchise, the Commission will notify the Applicant and any affected Local Entities of the reasons for the Applicant's ineligibility.

5. Step 5: State Video Franchise Issued for Complete Applications

The Commission, acting through the Executive Director, shall issue a State Video Franchise to the Applicant before the fourteenth calendar day after its

³⁴ The Commission will use the local authority contact information provided by the Applicant in the Application.

³⁵ CAL. PUB. UTIL. CODE § 5840(h)(1).

³⁶ Id. at § 5840(h)(2) ("If the commission finds the Application is complete, it shall issue a state franchise before the 14th calendar day after that finding.").

³⁷ Id. at § 5840(h)(3).

³⁸ Id.

determination that an Application is complete.³⁹ The form used to issue a State Video Franchise is found in Appendix B of the General Order.

B. Failure of Commission to Act on Application

If the Commission fails to notify the Applicant of the completeness or incompleteness of the Applicant's Application before the forty-fourth calendar day after receipt of an Application, the Commission's inaction shall be deemed to constitute issuance of the State Video Franchise, with no further action required on behalf of the Applicant.⁴⁰

A California State Video Franchise, however, is not deemed granted due to Commission failure to act when Applicant is statutorily ineligible for the State Video Franchise, pursuant to the requirements of §§ 5840(c), 5840(d), 5840(o), 5930(a), 5930(b), and 5930(c).

The Commission will notify an Applicant of any specific ground for ineligibility so that any condition of ineligibility may be remedied.

C. Protests to State Video Franchise Applications Disallowed

No person or entity may file a protest to an Application.

V. Ineligibility of Entities in Violation of the Cable Television and Video Providers Service and Information Act or the Video Customer Service Act

No person or corporation shall be eligible for a State Video Franchise, including a State Video Franchise obtained from transfer of an existing State Video Franchise, if that person or corporation is in violation of any final nonappealable order relating to either the Cable Television and Video Providers Customer Service and Information Act (Cal. Govt. Code §§ 53054 et seq.) or the Video Customer Service Act (Cal. Govt. Code §§ 53088 et seq.).⁴¹

VI. The State Video Franchise – Authorization to Offer Service, Obligations, Amendment, Transfer, Voluntary Termination, and Miscellaneous Changes

A. Authorization to Offer Service

³⁹ Id. at § 5840(h)(2).

⁴⁰ Id. at § 5840(h)(4).

⁴¹ CAL. PUB. UTIL. CODE § 5840(d).

1. Grants of Authority

It is unlawful to provide Video Service without a state or locally issued franchise.⁴² The issuance of a State Video Franchise represents the Commission's determination that an Applicant has satisfied the statutory requirements pursuant to DIVCA to offer Video Service. The document in which the Commission memorializes the issuance of a State Video Franchise serves as proof of the Commission's grant of authority to provide Video Service, but does not itself constitute authority to offer Video Service.

Each State Video Franchise issued by the Commission includes (1) a grant of authority to provide Video Service in the Video Service Area as requested in the Application; (2) a grant of authority, in exchange for the franchise fee adopted under Public Utilities Code Section 5840(q), to use the public rights-of-way for the delivery of Video Service subject to the laws of California; and (3) a statement that the grant of the authority is subject to the lawful operation of the Video Service by the Applicant or its successor-in-interest.⁴³

2. Duration of a State Video Franchise

A State Video Franchise is effective for ten years after the date of its issuance.⁴⁴

B. State Video Franchise Obligations

1. Obligations Imposed by Statute

State Video Franchise Holders are required to comply with all federal and state statutes, rules, and regulations. All California operations of a State Video Franchise Holder and its Affiliates shall be included for the purposes of applying Public Utilities Code §§ 5840, 5890, 5960, and 5940.

2. Enforcement of Obligations

A State Video Franchise is subject to suspension or revocation if a Video Service Provider fails to comply with the applicable requirements of Division 2.5 the Public Utilities Code.⁴⁵ In addition, the Commission shall not renew a State

⁴² Id. at § 5840(k).

⁴³ Id. at § 5840(i).

⁴⁴ Id. at § 5850(a).

⁴⁵ Id. at § 5890(g).

Video Franchise if the State Video Franchise Holder is in violation of any final nonappealable court order issued pursuant to Division 2.5 of the Public Utilities Code.⁴⁶

C. Amending a State Video Franchise

A State Video Franchise Holder may amend a State Video Franchise in order to reflect changes to its Video Service Area.⁴⁷

1. Fee for Amending a State Video Franchise

There is no fee associated with such amendments to reflect changes in service territory, but in general, the Commission's amendment process tracks the State Video Franchise Application process as set forth below.⁴⁸

2. Procedures for Filing a Supplemental Application

A State Video Franchise Holder seeking a Video Service Area amendment (whether an increase or decrease) shall file a supplemental Application to its initial Application that clearly shows the new boundaries of the affected service areas,⁴⁹ describes any and all Local Entities impacted by the new service area, and further amends all sections of the prior Application affected by the change in service territory or other factors. This supplemental Application shall be numbered sequentially in the document title, starting with the first supplemental Application filed by a State Video Franchise Holder.

One original and one copy of the supplemental Application shall be filed with the Commission's Docket Office and concurrently served on any Local Entities affected by the change in Video Service Area.

3. Commission Review and Issuance of a Supplemental Application

The Commission, acting through the Executive Director, will notify the State Video Franchise Holder and any affected Local Entities whether the

⁴⁶ Id. at § 5850 (d).

⁴⁷ Id. at § 5840(f).

⁴⁸ See id. at § 5840.

⁴⁹ Id. at § 5840(m)(6).

supplemental Application is complete or incomplete on or before the thirtieth calendar day following the filing date of the supplemental Application. The State Video Franchise Holder will have the opportunity to remedy any incomplete supplemental Application. Once an incomplete Application is refiled with the missing information, the Commission will have 30 days to determine the completeness of a supplemented Application.

The Commission's failure to notify the State Video Franchise Holder of a supplemental Application's completeness or incompleteness before the forty-fourth calendar day after the receipt of a supplemental Application shall be deemed to constitute issuance of the amended franchise, so long as the State Video Franchise Holder is not statutorily ineligible for a new, renewed, or transferred State Video Franchise pursuant to DIVCA.

D. Transfer of a State Video Franchise

1. Necessary Conditions for the Transfer of a State Video Franchise

A State Video Franchise may be transferred to a successor-in-interest of the State Video Franchise Holder to which the State Video Franchise was originally granted. This transfer may be as a result of merger, sale, assignment, bankruptcy, restructuring, or any other type of transaction, so long as two conditions are met:

- (1) Prior to the transfer, the transferee (successor-in-interest) submits to the Commission and all affected Local Entities all of the information required by this General Order of an initial Applicant for a State Video Franchise; and

- (2) The transferee submits an affidavit stating that it agrees that any collective bargaining agreement entered into by the predecessor-in-interest State Video Franchise Holder shall continue to be honored, paid, or performed to the same extent as would be required if the predecessor-in-interest State Video Franchise Holder continued to operate for the duration of the State Video Franchise, unless the duration of the collective bargaining agreement is limited by its own terms or by state or federal law.⁵⁰

2. Commission Review of the Transfer of a State Video Franchise

The Commission will process the Application for transfer of a State Video Franchise pursuant to the same standards applicable to an Application for a new State Video Franchise.

E. Voluntary Termination of a State Video Franchise

A State Video Franchise Holder may terminate its State Video Franchise by submitting at least 90 days' prior written notice to the Commission, affected Local Entities, and all of its customers.⁵¹

Within 14 business days after termination of a State Video Franchise, the State Video Franchise Holder shall inform the Commission and the affected Local Entities of the number of customers in the service area of the State Video Franchise being terminated; and the method by which customers were notified of the termination, including a copy of such customer notice.⁵²

F. Miscellaneous Changes

As a condition of being issued a State Video Franchise, a State Video Franchise Holder must notify the Commission and affected Local Entities within 14 business days of the following:

⁵⁰ Id. at §§ 5840(l), 5970.

⁵¹ Id. at § 5840(j).

⁵² Id. at § 5840(m)(5).

- (1) Any transaction involving a change in the ownership, operation, control, or corporate organization of the State Video Franchise Holder, including but not limited to a merger, acquisition, or reorganization;
- (2) A change in the State Video Franchise Holder's legal name or the adoption of, or change to, an assumed business name. Notification to the Commission shall consist of a certified copy of either of the following:
 - (a) the proposed amendment to the State Video Franchise, or
 - (b) the certificate of assumed business name; or
- (3) A change in the State Video Franchise Holder's principal business address or the name or business address of the person authorized to receive notice on behalf of the State Video Franchise Holder.⁵³

VII. Reporting Requirements

A. Reports for Collection of the User Fee

The Commission may require a State Video Franchise Holder to furnish information and reports to the Commission, at the time or times the Commission specifies, to enable the Commission to determine the User Fee pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 441.⁵⁴

Any Video Service Provider required to submit information and reports pursuant to Article 4 to Chapter 2.5 of Part 1 of Division 1 of the Public Utilities Code, in lieu thereof, submit information or reports made to any other governmental agency if all of the following conditions are met: (i) the alternate information or reports contain all of the information required by the Commission; (ii) the requirements to which the alternate reports or information are responsive are clearly identified; and (iii) the information or reports are certified by the Video Service Provider to be true and correct.⁵⁵

⁵³ Id. at § 5840(m).

⁵⁴ Id. at § 443(a).

⁵⁵ Id. at § 443(b).

State video franchise holders with annual gross state video franchise revenues of \$750,000 or less shall pay the fee to the Commission on an annual basis on or before January 15 of the following year.

State video franchise holders with annual gross state video franchise video revenues greater than \$750,000 shall pay the user fee to the Commission on a quarterly basis, between the first and fifteenth days of July, October, January, and April.⁵⁶

B. Annual Employment Reports

1. Reporting Obligations Imposed on State Video Franchise Holders with More than 750 California Employees

A State Video Franchise Holder employing more than 750 total employees in California shall report to the Commission annual employment information, as of January 1 of the year in which it first was issued a State Video Franchise and each year thereafter. These reports shall include the following information:

- (1) The number of California residents employed by the State Video Franchise Holder, calculated on a full-time or full-time equivalent basis.
- (2) The percentage of the State Video Franchise Holder's total domestic workforce that resides in California, calculated on a full-time or full-time equivalent basis.

⁵⁶ See PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE § 433 (establishing a fee payment schedule based on gross intrastate revenues above or below a threshold of \$750,000).

- (3) The types and numbers of jobs by occupational classification held by residents of California employed by State Video Franchise Holders and the average pay and benefits of those jobs and, separately, the number of out-of-state residents employed by independent contractors, companies, and consultants hired by the State Video Franchise Holder, calculated on a full-time or full-time equivalent basis, when the State Video Franchise Holder is not contractually prohibited from disclosing the information to the public. This paragraph applies only to those employees of an independent contractor, company, or consultant that are personally providing services to the State Video Franchise Holder, and does not apply to employees of an independent contractor, company, or consultant not personally performing services for the State Video Franchise Holder.
- (4) The number of net new positions proposed to be created directly by the State Video Franchise Holder during the upcoming year by occupational classifications and by category of full-time, part-time, temporary, and contract employees.⁵⁷

These reports shall be filed with the Commission no later than April 1 for each annual reporting period.

2. Commission Reports to Legislative Committees

The Commission shall annually report the information required to be reported by State Video Franchise Holders pursuant to Rule VII.B.1 to the Assembly Committee on Utilities and Commerce and the Senate Committee on Energy, Utilities and Communications, or their successor committees, and within a reasonable time thereafter, shall make the information available to the public on its Internet website.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ Id. at § 5920(a).

⁵⁸ Id. at § 5920(b).

C. Annual Reports on Broadband and Video Services

1. Reporting Obligations Imposed on State Video Franchise Holders

Commencing on April 1, 2008 and annually no later than April 1 each year thereafter, a State Video Franchise Holder shall report to the Commission and DRA annual information on a Census Tract basis as of January 1, 2008 and each year thereafter on the extent to which it provides Video and Broadband Service in the state. These reports shall include the following information, pursuant to the guidelines established in Appendix D and Appendix E of R. [XX-XX-XX]:⁵⁹

(1) Broadband Information:⁶⁰

- (a) The number of Households in each Census Tract to which the State Video Franchise Holder makes Broadband available in this state. Alternatively, the State Video Franchise Holder may submit a reasonable approximation of the number of Households in each Census Tract if the State Video Franchise Holder is able to produce information that successfully demonstrates to the Commission (i) that the State Video Franchise Holder does not maintain this information on a Census Tract basis in the normal course of business and (ii) the State Video Franchise Holder's alternate reporting methodology produces a reasonable approximation of data reported by Census Tract.⁶¹
- (b) The number of Households in each Census Tract that subscribe to Broadband that the State Video Franchise Holder makes available in this state.

⁵⁹ For example, the first report filed April 1, 2008 would be for calendar year 2007 (January to December 2007).

⁶⁰ CAL. PUB. UTIL. CODE § 5960(b)(1).

⁶¹ We note that Public Utilities Code § 5960(b)(1)(B) requires State Video Franchise Holders to report Broadband customer subscribership on a Census Tract basis (without any approximation), and since State Video Franchise Holders will have to record this Broadband information by Census Tract, we expect that it will be difficult for a State Video Franchise Holder to successfully demonstrate that it does not maintain other forms of Broadband information on a Census Tract basis.

- (c) The extent to which the Broadband provided by the State Video Franchise Holder to individual Households in each Census Tract utilizes wireline-based facilities or another technology. If another technology is used by the State Franchise Holder, it shall specify the technology.
- (2) Video Information⁶²
 - (a) If the State Video Franchise Holder is a Telephone Corporation:
 - (i) the number of Households in each Census Tract of the State Video Franchise Holder's Telephone Service Area; and
 - (ii) the number of Households in each Census Tract of the State Video Franchise Holder's Telephone Service Area that are offered Video Service by the State Video Franchise Holder.
 - (b) If the State Video Franchise Holder is not a Telephone Corporation:
 - (i) the number of Households in each Census Tract of the State Video Franchise Holder's Video Service Area; and
 - (ii) the number of Households in each Census Tract of the State Video Franchise Holder's Video Service Area that are offered Video Service by the State Video Franchise Holder.
- (3) Low-Income Household Information⁶³
 - (a) The number of Low-Income Households in each Census Tract of the State Video Franchise Holder's Video Service Area.
 - (b) The number of Low-Income Households in the State Video Franchise Holder's Video Service Area that are

⁶² Id. at § 5960(b)(2).

⁶³ Id. at § 5960(b)(3).

offered Video Service by the State Video Franchise Holder.

In accordance with Appendix E of R. [XX-XX-XX], State Video Franchise Holders shall utilize data based on U.S. Census Bureau estimates adjusted annually to reflect rates of changes and distribution through January 1, 2007 to determine the number of Low-Income Households.

In accordance with Appendix E of R. [XX-XX-XX], State Video Franchise Holders shall utilize data based on U.S. Census Bureau estimates adjusted annually to reflect rates of changes and distribution through January 1 after the conclusion of each annual reporting period.

If a State Video Franchise is transferred to a successor-in-interest of the State Video Franchise Holder to which the certificate originally is granted, the transferee shall submit to the Commission of the information required by Public Utilities Code Section 5960.⁶⁴

2. Commission Reports to the Legislature and Governor

The Commission, no later than July 1, 2008 and annually no later than July 1 thereafter, shall submit to the Legislature and Governor a report that includes information submitted by State Video Franchise Holders as to Broadband, Video Service, and Low-Income data, aggregated according to technology used in service provision.⁶⁵

All information submitted to the Commission and reported by the Commission pursuant to this section shall be disclosed to the public only as provided for pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 583.⁶⁶ No individually identifiable customer information shall be subject to public disclosure.⁶⁷

D. Information on Service to Community Centers

A State Video Franchise Holder or its Affiliates with more than 1,000,000 telephone customers in California shall report annual information, as of

⁶⁴ Id. at § 5970(a).

⁶⁵ Id. at § 5960(c).

⁶⁶ Id. at § 5960(d).

⁶⁷ Id.

January 1 of the year in which its State Video Franchise is granted and each year thereafter, on the extent to which the State Video Franchise Holder makes Video and Broadband Service available at no cost to Community Centers in underserved areas, as determined by the State Video Franchise Holder. The reports shall include the following information:

- (1) The number of Community Centers in underserved areas where the State Video Franchise Holder provides Video and Broadband Service without charge.
- (2) ~~The number of video customers subscribing to the State Video Franchise Holder's Video Service.~~⁶⁸

The Community Center reports shall be filed with the Commission and DRA on a date no later than April 1 after the conclusion of each annual reporting period.

E. Annual Reports on Collective Bargaining

A State Video Franchise Holder shall report to the Commission whether its California employees are covered by a collective bargaining agreement. This report shall be filed with the Commission on a date no later than April 1 after the conclusion of each annual reporting period.

G. Workplace Diversity Reports

If a State Video Franchise Holder declines to provide workplace diversity data equivalent to that of other California Utilities Diversity Council members, the State Video Franchise Holder shall provide the Commission a concurrent copy of all future Employment Information Report EEO-1 filings when it submits these filings to the federal Department of Labor. If they are multi-establishment employers, State Video Franchise Holders subject to this requirement shall provide the Commission EEO-1 reports that describe workplace diversity of both the parent company and its California Affiliates. This report shall be filed with the Commission no later than April 1 after the conclusion of each annual reporting period.

F. Additional Information

The Commission reserves the authority to require additional reports that are necessary to the enforcement of specific DIVCA provisions.

⁶⁸ Id. at § 5890(b)(3).

(END OF APPENDIX B)

ATTACHMENT A
Page 1

General Order XXX
Implementing The Digital Infrastructure and
Video Competition Act of 2006 (DIVCA)

ATTACHMENT A

ATTACHMENT A



APPLICATION FOR A NEW OR AMENDED CALIFORNIA STATE VIDEO FRANCHISE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Definitions for the purposes of this Application:

- A. “Affiliate” means any company 5 per cent or more of whose outstanding securities are owned, controlled, or held with power to vote, directly or indirectly either by a state video franchise holder or any of its subsidiaries, or by that state video franchise holder’s controlling corporation and/or any of its subsidiaries as well as any company in which the state video franchise holder, its controlling corporation, or any of the state video franchise holder’s affiliates exert substantial control over the operation of the company and/or indirectly have substantial financial interests in the company exercised through means other than ownership.
- B. “Applicant” means any person or entity that files an application seeking to provide Video Service in the state pursuant to a State Video Franchise.
- C. “Application” means the form prescribed by the Commission through which an Applicant may apply for a State Video Franchise or amend its Video Service Area.
- D. “Application Fee” means any fee that the Commission imposes to recover its actual and reasonable costs of processing an Application.¹
- E. “Area” means a set of contiguous (i) collections of census block groups or (ii) regions that are mapped using geographic information system technology.
- F. “Broadband” or “Broadband Service” means any service defined as Broadband, or having advanced telecommunications capability, in the most recent Federal Communications Commission inquiry pursuant to Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-104).²

¹ CAL. PUB. UTIL. CODE § 5840(c). This fee is not levied for general revenue purposes, consistent with Public Utilities Code § 5840(c).

² *Id.* at § 5830(a). The Federal Communications Commission currently uses the term “broadband” and “advanced telecommunications capability” to describe services and facilities with an upstream (customer-to-provider) and downstream (provider-to-customer) transmission speed of more than 200 kilobits per second. FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, AVAILABILITY OF ADVANCED TELECOMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY IN THE UNITED STATES, FOURTH REPORT TO CONGRESS, FCC 04-208, 10 (Sept. 9,

- G. “Census Block Group” has the same meaning as used by the U.S. Census Bureau.
- H. “Census Tract” has the same meaning as used by the U.S. Census Bureau.³
- I. “Commission” means the Public Utilities Commission.
- J. “Company” means the Applicant and its Affiliates.
- K. “DIVCA” means Assembly Bill 2987, the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006 (Ch. 700, Stats. 2006).⁴
- L. “Household” means, consistent with the U.S. Census Bureau, a house, apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is intended for occupancy as separate living quarters.⁵ Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live and eat separately from any other persons in building and which have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall.⁶
- M. “Local Entity” means any city, county, city and county, or joint powers authority within the state within whose jurisdiction a State Video Franchise Holder may provide Video Service.⁷
- N. “Low-Income Household” means a residential Household where the average annual Household income is less than \$35,000, as based on U.S. Census Bureau estimates adjusted annually to reflect rates of change and distribution through January 1, 2007.⁸
- O. “State Video Franchise” means a franchise issued pursuant to DIVCA.⁹
- P. “State Video Franchise Holder” means a person or group of persons that has been issued a State Video Franchise from the Commission pursuant to Division 2.5 of DIVCA.¹⁰

2004). This definition, however, is under review by the Commission, and it may evolve in response to rapid technological changes in the marketplace. Id.

³ CAL. PUB. UTIL. CODE at § 5960(a).

⁴ In this Application, all further references to Public Utilities Code sections are to those sections adopted or amended in DIVCA.

⁵ Id. at § 5890(j)(1).

⁶ Id.

⁷ Id. at § 5830(k).

⁸ Id. at § 5890(j)(2) (defining “low-income households” for the purposes of imposing build-out requirements).

⁹ Id. at § 5830(p).

¹⁰ Id. at § 5830(i).

- Q. “Telephone Service Area” means the area where the Commission has granted an entity a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to provide telephone service.
- R. “Telephone Corporation” means a telephone corporation as defined in Public Utilities Code § Section 234.
- S. “Video Service” means video programming services, cable service, or open-video system service provided through facilities located at least in part in public rights-of-way without regard to delivery technology, including Internet protocol or other technology. This definition does not include (1) any video programming provided by a commercial mobile service provider defined in Section 322(d) of Title 47 of the United States Code, or (2) video programming provided as part of, and via, a service that enables users to access content, information, electronic mail, or other services offered over the public Internet.¹¹
- T. “Video Service Area” means the area proposed to be served under a State Video Franchise.
- U. “Video Service Provider” means any entity providing Video Service.¹²

PLEASE TYPE ALL INFORMATION UNLESS INSTRUCTED OTHERWISE.

Type of Application

1. Check as appropriate:
- ☐ New Franchise ☐ Amended Franchise

Applicant Information

2. Applicant’s State Video Franchise number (if seeking an amended Franchise):

3. Applicant’s full legal name:

4. Name under which the Applicant does or will offer video service ~~do business~~ in California:

5. Legal name and contact information of Applicant’s parent companies, including the ultimate parent:

¹¹ Id. at § 5830(s).

¹² Id. at § 5830(t).

Parent's Full Legal Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Parent's Full Legal Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Parent's Full Legal Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

6. Applicant's principal place of business:

Address: _____

Phone: _____

7. Contact information for the person responsible for ongoing communication with the Commission about Video Service business:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

Phone (Business and mobile if any): _____

Fax: _____

Email: _____

8. Attach as Appendix A the names and titles of the Applicant's principal officers.

Build-Out Information

Answer questions 9 through 11 only if the Applicant or one of its Affiliates is a Telephone Corporation. Other Applicants should go to Question 13.

9. Does the Applicant alone or together with its affiliates have more than 1,000,000 telephone customers in California?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
10. Does the Video Service Area include areas outside of the Telephone Service Area of the Applicant and its Affiliates?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
11. Excluding direct-to-home satellite, is Video Service currently offered by another Video Service Provider in the Video Service Area proposed in this Application?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No

Existing Local Cable or Video Franchise Holder Information

~~Answer Question 12 only Applicant or its Affiliates is not an existing local cable or video franchise holder.~~

12. Does the Applicant alone or together with its Affiliates currently hold a local franchise, or has the Applicant held a local franchise in the last six months, in the Video Service Area?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- If "Yes," then download and complete the electronic template available at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/video/application>.*

Video Service Area Information

13. Provide a geographic description of the Video Service Area that is to be served pursuant to this Application under the State Video Franchise.

The description shall be as detailed below:

- a. A collection of U.S. Census Bureau Census Block Groups, or
- b. A geographic information system digital boundary meeting or exceeding national map accuracy standards.
 - o *If Applicant chooses "a," then download and complete the electronic template available at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/video/application>.*
 - o *If Applicant chooses "b," then submit the geographic information system digital boundary in digital format electronically ~~and on a CD~~ to the Commission.*

- ~~13.~~ 14. Provide, as detailed below, a description of the socioeconomic status information of residents within the Video Service Area to be served pursuant to a State Video Franchise.
- o *The Applicant shall provide this description utilizing the template available at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/video/application>.*

Information requirements:

- a. Unless directed otherwise below, Applicant shall submit socioeconomic status information as of January 1 of the year in which the Applicant or State Video Franchise Holder applies for a State Video Franchise or an amendment to a State Video Franchise.
- b. This socioeconomic status information shall include at a minimum the following information, as designated by individual Census Tract included in the Video Service Area

~~i. Broadband (Utilize the most recent publicly available U.S. Census information to determine the number of Households):~~

- ~~1. The number of Households in each Census Tract to which the Company makes Broadband available.~~
- ~~2. The number of Households in each Census Tract that subscribe to Broadband that the Company makes available.~~
- ~~3. Whether the Broadband Services provided by the Company to individual Households in each Census Tract utilize wireline-based facilities or another technology. If another technology is used, Applicant shall specify the technology.~~

~~ii. Video service (Utilize the most recent publicly available U.S. Census information to determine the number of Households):~~

- ~~1. The number of Households in each Census Tract.~~
- ~~2. The number of Households in each Census Tract that are offered Video Service by the Company.~~

~~iii.i. Low-Income (Utilize the January 1, 2007 most recent publicly available U.S. Census information to determine the number of Low-Income Households):~~

- ~~1. The number of Low-Income Households in each Census Tract.~~
- ~~2. The number of Low-Income Households that are eligible for Video Service offered by the Company.~~

15. If the Applicant or any of its affiliates or subsidiaries is a Telephone Corporation, the Applicant shall provide a description of the socioeconomic status information of all residents within its Telephone Service Area.

- o *The Applicant shall provide this description utilizing the template available at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/video/application>.*

Information requirements:

- a. Unless directed otherwise below, Applicant shall submit socioeconomic status information as of January 1 of the year in which the Applicant or State Video Franchise Holder applies for a State Video Franchise or an amendment to a State Video Franchise.
 - b. This socioeconomic status information shall include at a minimum the following information, as designated by individual Census Tract included in the Telephone Service Area:
 - ~~i. Broadband (Utilize the most recent publicly available U.S. Census information to determine the number of Households):~~
 - ~~1. The number of Households in each Census Tract to which the Company makes Broadband available.~~
 - ~~2. The number of Households in each Census Tract that subscribe to Broadband that the Company makes available.~~
 - ~~3. Whether the Broadband Services provided by the Company to individual Households in each Census Tract utilize wireline-based facilities or another technology. If another technology is used, Applicant shall specify the technology.~~
 - ~~ii. Video service (Utilize the most recent publicly available U.S. Census information to determine the number of Households):~~
 - ~~1. The number of Households in each Census Tract.~~
 - ~~2. The number of Households in each Census Tract that are offered Video Service by the Company.~~
 - ~~iii.i. Low-Income (Utilize the January 1, 2007 most recent publicly available U.S. Census information to determine the number of Low-Income Households):~~
 - ~~1. The number of Low-Income Households in each Census Tract.~~
 - ~~2. The number of Low-Income Households that are eligible for Video Service offered by the Company.~~
16. Utilizing the template provided at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/video/application>, the Applicant shall input the expected date for the deployment of Video Service for each Area in the Video Service Area.

Financial, Legal, and Technical Qualifications

17. Attach to this Application, as Appendix C, a copy of a fully executed bond in the amount of \$100,000 per 20,000 households in the Video Service Area, with a \$100,000 minimum and a \$500,000 maximum. The bond must list the Commission as obligee and be issued by a corporate surety authorized to transact a surety business in California.

Local Entity Contact Information

18. Utilizing the template provided at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/video/application>, the Applicant shall provide the contact name and information for a representative from each Local Entity within the Video Service Area.

Application Fee

19. Attach to this Application a check in the amount of \$2,000 made payable to the "California Public Utilities Commission."

Affidavit

20. Complete and submit the affidavit attached to this Application.

A COMPLETE APPLICATION MUST INCLUDE:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completed Application form | <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix B: <u>Affidavit</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CD(s) or other electronic | <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix C: <u>Bond</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>document</u> containing template(s) and | <input type="checkbox"/> Check in the amount of \$2,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> data from the Commission website | <input type="checkbox"/> Completed Affidavit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix A: <u>List of Corporate</u> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Officers (Q. 8)</u> | |

APPENDIX A

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF _____

COUNTY OF _____

My name is _____. I am _____ (Title) of _____ (Company). My personal knowledge of the facts stated herein has been derived from my employment with _____ (Company).

I swear or affirm that I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this Application for a California State Video Franchise to provide Video Service, that I am competent to testify to them, and that I have the authority to make this Application on behalf of and to bind the Company. I further swear or affirm that _____ [Name of Applicant]:

1. Has filed or will timely file with the Federal Communications Commission all forms required by the Federal Communications Commission before offering Video Service in this state.
2. Agrees to provide CPUC with the detailed socioeconomic data that may be required for Annual Reporting requested in Questions 14 and 15 within three months of granting of the initial application.
- ~~2.3.~~ Agrees to comply with all lawful city, county, or city and county regulations regarding the time, place, and manner of using the public rights-of-way, including but not limited to, payment of applicable encroachment, permit, and inspection fees.
- ~~3.4.~~ Will concurrently deliver a copy of this Application to each any Local Entity within the Video Service Area where Applicant will provide service.
- ~~4.5.~~ Possesses the financial, legal, and technical qualifications necessary to construct and operate the proposed system and promptly repair any damage to the public rights-of-way caused by Applicant.
- ~~5.6.~~ Is not in violation of any final nonappealable order relating to either the Cable Television and Video Providers Customer Service and Information Act (California Public Utilities Code Article 3.5 (commencing with § 53054) of Chapter 1 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code) or the Video Customer Service Act (California Public Utilities Code Article 4.5 (commencing with § 53088) of Chapter 1 or Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code).

I further swear or affirm that _____ [Name of Company] agrees to comply with all federal and state statutes, rules, and regulations, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. As provided in Public Utilities Code § 5890, Applicant will not discriminate in the provision of Video Service.
2. Applicant will abide by all applicable consumer protection laws and rules as provided in Public Utilities Code § 5900.

APPENDIX A

3. Applicant will remit the fee required by California Public Utilities Code § 5860(a) to the Local Entity.
4. Applicant will provide public, educational, and governmental access channels and the required funding as required by Public Utilities Code § 5870.
5. Applicant and any and all of its Affiliates' operations in California now and in the future shall be included for the purposes of applying Public Utilities Code §§ 5840, 5890, 5960, and 5940. Applicant specifically attests to the following:
 - a. Reporting Requirements: Either (i) Applicant or (ii) the parent company of Applicant shall produce Commission-mandated reports for and on behalf of Applicant and any and all its Affiliates that operate in California.
 - b. Antidiscrimination:
 - i. If Applicant and its Affiliates together have more than one million telephone customers in California, Applicant shall satisfy the build-out requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code § 5890(b) & (e).
 - ii. If Applicant and its Affiliates together have less than one million telephone customers in California, Applicant shall satisfy any build-out requirements established pursuant in Public Utilities Code § 5890(c).
 - c. Cross-subsidization: Applicant refrains from using any rate increase of its or its Affiliates' basic telephone service offerings to reduce costs of Applicant's video service offerings.
 - d. "Affiliate," as referenced herein, means any company 5 per cent or more of whose outstanding securities are owned, controlled, or held with power to vote, directly or indirectly either by a state video franchise holder or any of its subsidiaries, or by that state video franchise holder's controlling corporation and/or any of its subsidiaries as well as any company in which the state video franchise holder, its controlling corporation, or any of the state video franchise holder's affiliates exert substantial control over the operation of the company and/or indirectly have substantial financial interests in the company exercised through means other than ownership.
6. Applicant shall fulfill all other requirements imposed by the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act.

I swear or affirm that all of the statements and representations made in this Application are true and correct.

Signature and title

APPENDIX A

Typed or printed name and title

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me on the _____ day of _____, 20____.

Notary Public In and For the State of _____.

My Commission expires: _____



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102
www.cpuc.ca.gov

CALIFORNIA VIDEO FRANCHISE CERTIFICATE

1) Franchise Holder:

Name: _____

Address: _____

2) Application Date: _____

3) Effective Date: _____

4) Expiration Date: _____

5) Affected Local Entities¹ _____
(attach additional sheets if necessary)

Issued at San Francisco this _____ Day of _____, 20_____.

Signed

¹ The franchise granted herein may include all or part of the Affected Local Entities' territory. For more information on the service area covered by this franchise, contact the Public Utilities Commission.

(END OF ATTACHMENT A)

Appendix D: “Census Tract Basis” Reporting for Availability Data

This Appendix describes technical requirements for broadband and video availability reports. We recognize that some video service providers may keep records that match their potential customers’ addresses with Census Block Groups, while others may catalog these addresses in alternate formulations that do not nest neatly within Census Tracts. For the latter, inherent imprecision is introduced when smaller groupings of spatial data are aggregated into larger Census Tracts.¹ This imprecision must be balanced with the need to maintain appropriate and consistent levels of detailed information required for informing our policy decisions. This Appendix, therefore, adopts standards for availability data reporting on a “census tract basis.”

Applicants and state video franchise holders are deemed to have submitted availability data on a “census tract basis” if the following standards and conditions are fulfilled:

1. Broadband and video data is reported to the Commission in the template(s) created by the Commission, if the Commission’s public website provides the template(s) for applicants’ or state video franchise holders’ use.
2. Broadband and video data is collected either on the basis of:
 - a. Current Census Block Groups: Census Block Groups at the most recent U.S. Census.
 - b. Alternate Geospatial Areas: Geospatial areas that (i) contain on average no more housing units [fn 2] than the average Current Census Block Group in California and (ii) ~~under no circumstances are greater than 1,000 housing units.~~
3. Where Census Tract data provided to the Commission is wholly based upon data that is collected either by (i) Current Census Block Groups or (ii) Alternate Geospatial Areas that are entirely contained within a single Census Tract at the most recent U.S. Census (Current Census Tract), the video service provider shall produce the Current Census Tract number and associated broadband and video data. The video service provider also shall indicate that the data reported falls entirely within a single Current Census Tract (e.g., Aggregate_Flag = 1).
4. Where Census Tract data provided to the Commission is based upon data that is not collected by areas that are entirely contained within a single Current Census Tract, the video service provider must provide the Commission the following information for each Current Census Tract:
 - a. The Census Tract number.
 - b. Broadband and video data for households in the Census Tract. Broadband and video data shall be assigned to Census Tracts by consistently using one of the two following methods:

- i. An Alternate Geospatial Area is assigned to a Current Census Tract if that Tract contains the mean population weighted geographic center of Census Block Nodes falling within the Alternate Geospatial Area.
- ii. An Alternate Geospatial Area is assigned to a Current Census Tract if that Tract contains the highest population of summed Census Block Nodes falling within the Alternate Geospatial Area.
- c. A field indicating of method of choice for associating data with the Census Tract (e.g., Aggregate_Flagmethod = '21' for mean weighted center method, Aggregate_Flagmethod = '23' for highest population method).
- d. A field indicating the number of Alternate Geospatial Areas that cross over the boundaries of the Census Tract (e.g., Aggregate_Flag = 2 for a Census Tract that contains two Alternate Geospatial Areas that fall within more than one Census Tract; Aggregate_Flag = 3 for a Census Tract that contains three Alternate Geospatial Areas that fall within more than one Census Tract).
- e. A field indicating the summed population of all Census Block Nodes contained within Alternate Geospatial Areas that (i) fall within more than one Census Tract and (ii) are assigned to the Census Tract.

Footnote 2

A housing unit is a house, an apartment, a mobile home or trailer, a group of rooms, or a single room occupied as a separate living quarters, or if vacant, intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other individuals in the building and which have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall. For vacant units, the criteria of separateness and direct access are applied to the intended occupants whenever possible.

Appendix E: Data for Demographic Reporting Requirements

DIVCA requires state video franchise holders to submit demographic data on population and income distribution. These data shall be based upon projections from the most recent U.S. Census data.

A. Acceptable Sources of Demographic Data

Projections of U.S. Census data typically are not publicly available. To produce this required demographic data, state video franchise holders shall rely on data and projections from private vendors capable of producing reliable projections based on U.S. Census data (“current census data”). The fair, uniform, and consistent administration of DIVCA requires comparability among data sources. These data will be used by the Commission to assess compliance with a variety of DIVCA provisions.

By the date of the final order, the Commission shall compile a list of acceptable vendors from which it will accept demographic data. The Commission will post the list of acceptable vendors on its public website. State video franchise holders that desire to submit data from a vendor not on the Commission’s list must first file a petition with the Commission that details the alternate vendor’s comparability with the sources on the Commission’s list. An alternate vendor may be used only if the state video franchise holder receives written permission to do so from Commission staff in the video franchise unit.

B. Calculation of Household Information

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code §§ 5840(e)(6) and 5960(b), video service providers must report, on a Census Tract basis, information on housing units in their service areas. The following approximations may be used in producing this data along with the methodology for approximation outlined in Appendix D, when the service areas do not nest neatly within Census Block Groups:

1. Number of Households in the Telephone Service Area: The video service provider compiles housing unit counts from individual Census Block Groups falling within its telephone service area. Housing unit counts by Census Block Group are then summed to produce Census Tract results.
2. Number of Households in the Video Service Area: The video service provider compiles individual housing unit counts from Census Block Groups falling within its video service area. Housing unit counts by Census Block Group are then summed to produce Census Tract results.
3. Number of Low-Income Households in the Video Service Area: The video service provider determines the number of low-income housing units in the service

area by taking ~~compiles~~ the number of low-income household housing unit counts by ~~from~~ individual Census Block Groups falling within its video service area as a percentage of the total households in the individual Census Block Group.

This percentage is multiplied by the total number of housing units in the individual Census Block Group to give the total number of low-income housing units in the individual Census Block Group. This is then ~~-Housing unit counts by Census Block Group then are~~ summed to produce Census Tract results.

4. Number of Low-Income Households Offered Video Service: The video service provider multiplies (i) the total number of housing units it offers video service in a Census Block Group by (ii) the percentage of low-income housing units in the Census Block Group used in Item #3. ~~The percentage of low-income housing units is calculated by dividing the number of low-income housing units (Item #3) by the total house units in a Census Block Group (Item #4).~~ Census Block Group counts of low-income housing units offered video service then are then summed to produce Census Tract counts.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the **OPENING COMMENTS OF AT&T CALIFORNIA (U 1001 C) ON THE PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER CHONG, MAILED JANUARY 16, 2006** in **R.06-10-005** by electronic mail and/or by hand-delivery to the person in the official Service List.

Executed this 5th day of February 2007, at San Francisco, California.

AT&T CALIFORNIA
525 Market Street, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

/s/

Thomas J. Selhorst

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Service Lists

Proceeding: R0610005 - CPUC - CABLE TELEVIS

Filer: CPUC - CABLE TELEVISION

List Name: INITIALLIST

Last changed: January 16, 2007

[Download the Comma-delimited File](#)
[About Comma-delimited Files](#)

[Back to Service Lists Index](#)

Appearance

WILLIAM H. WEBER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
CBeyond COMMUNICATIONS
320 INTERSTATE NORTH PARKWAY
ATLANTA, GA 30339

ANN JOHNSON
VERIZON
HQE02F61
600 HIDDEN RIDGE
IRVING, TX 75038

DAVID C. RODRIGUEZ
STRATEGIC COUNSEL
523 WEST SIXTH STREET, SUITE 1128
LOS ANGELES, CA 90014

MAGGLE HEALY
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
415 DIAMOND STREET
REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277

GERALD R. MILLER
CITY OF LONG BEACH
DIRECTOR
333 WEST OCEAN BLVD.
LONG BEACH, CA 90802

TRACEY L. HAUSE
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

CITY OF ARCADIA
240 W. HUNTINGTON DRIVE
ARCADIA, CA 91007

CYNTHIA J. KURTZ
CITY MANAGER
CITY OF PASADENA
117 E. COLORADO BLVD., 6TH FLOOR
PASADENA, CA 91105

ROB WISHNER
CITY OF WALNUT
21201 LA PUENTE ROAD
WALNUT, CA 91789

BARRY FRASER
CABLE FRANCHISE ADMINISTRATOR
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
1600 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, ROOM 208
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

ESTHER NORTHRUP
COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM, LLC
5159 FEDERAL BLVD.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92105

KIMBERLY M. KIRBY
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MEDIASPORTSCOM P.C.
350
3 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1650
IRVINE, CA 92614

BILL NUSBAUM
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

ELAINE M. DUNCAN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
VERIZON
350
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

REGINA COSTA
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

IZETTA C.R. JACKSON
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF OAKLAND
1 FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA, 10TH FLR.
OAKLAND, CA 94103

DAVID J. MILLER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
AT&T CALIFORNIA
ROOM 2018
525 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

FASSIL FENIKILE
AT&T CALIFORNIA
525 MARKET STREET, ROOM 1925
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

SYREETA GIBBS
AT&T CALIFORNIA
525 MARKET STREET, 19TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

TOM SELHORST
AT&T CALIFORNIA
525 MARKET STREET, 2023
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

ENRIQUE GALLARDO
LATINO ISSUES FORUM
160 PINE STREET, SUITE 700
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

MARK P. SCHREIBER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, LLP

PATRICK M. ROSVALL
ATTORNEY AT LAW
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER LLP

201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR
FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

WILLIAM L. LOWERY
MILLER VAN EATON, LLP
400 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 501
OF LAW
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121

ALLEN S. HAMMOND, IV
PROFESSOR OF LAW
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL
500 EL CAMINO REAL
SANTA CLARA, CA 94305

JOSEPH S. FABER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
LAW OFFICE OF JOSEPH S. FABER
3527 MT. DIABLO BLVD., SUITE 287
LAFAYETTE, CA 94549

DOUGLAS GARRETT
COX COMMUNICATIONS
2200 POWELL STREET, STE. 1035
EMERYVILLE, CA 94608

GLENN SEMOW
DIRECTOR STATE REGULATORY & LEGAL AFFAIR
TELECOMMUNICATIONS
CALIFORNIA CABLE & TELECOMMUNICATIONS
360 22ND STREET, NO. 750
OAKLAND, CA 94612

JEFFREY SINSHEIMER
CALIFORNIA CABLE &
360 22ND STREET, 750
OAKLAND, CA 94612

LESLA LEHTONEN
VP LEGAL & REGULATORY AFFAIRS
CALIFORNIA CABLE TELEVISION ASSOCIATION
ASSOCIATION
360 22ND STREET, NO. 750
OAKLAND, CA 94612

MARIA POLITZER
LEGAL DEPARTMENT ASSOCIATE
CALIFORNIA CABLE TELEVISION
360 22ND STREET, NO. 750
OAKLAND, CA 94612

MARK RUTLEDGE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS FELLOW
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SECOND FLR.
BERKELEY, CA 94704

PHILIP KAMLAZ
CITY OF BERKELEY
2180 MILVIA STREET
BERKELEY, CA 94704

ROBERT GNAIZDA
POLICY DIRECTOR/GENERAL COUNSEL
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
CALIFORNIA (CFC)
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SECOND FLOOR
340
BERKELEY, CA 94704

ALEXIS K. WODTKE
ATTORNEY AT LAW
CONSUMER FEDERATION OF
520 S. EL CAMINO REAL, STE.
SAN MATEO, CA 94941

WILLIAM HUGHES
ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF SAN JOSE
16TH FLOOR
200 EAST SANTA CLARA STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95113-1900

GREG R. GIERCZAK
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SURE WEST TELEPHONE
PO BOX 969
200 VERNON STREET
ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

PATRICK WHITNELL
LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES
AMERICA
1400 K STREET
SUITE 100
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

MARIE C. MALLIETT
THE COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF
2870 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE,
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833-3509

Information Only

KEVIN SAVILLE
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL
AFFAIRS
CITIZENS/FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS
2378 WILSHIRE BLVD.
MOUND, MN 55364

ALOA STEVENS
DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENT&EXTERNAL
FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS
PO BOX 708970
SANDY, UT 84070-8970

KEN SIMMONS
ACTING GENERAL MANAGER
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY
CITY HALL EAST, ROOM 1400
200 N. MAIN STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

LONNIE ELDRIDGE
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
CITY HALL EAST, SUITE 700
200 N. MAIN STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

RICHARD CHABRAN
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY TECHNOLOGY POLICY
1000 ALAMEDA STREET, SUITE 240
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

FLOOR

ROY MORALES
CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
CIYT OF LOS ANGELES
CITY HALL
200 N. SPRING STREET, 2ND

LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

STACY BURNETTE
ACTING CABLE TELEVISION DIV. MANAGER
OFFICER
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY
CITY HALL EAST, ROOM 1255
200 N. MAIN STREET

WILLIAM IMPERIAL
TELECOMMUNICATIONS REG.
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY
CITY HALL EAST, ROOM 1255
200 N. MAIN STREET

LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

GREG FUENTES
11041 SANTA MONICA BLVD., NO.629
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

SUITE 306

MICHAEL J. FRIEDMAN
VICE PRESIDENT
TELECOMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT CORP.
5757 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 645
LOS ANGELES, CA 90036

SUSAN WILSON
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
RIVERSIDE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
3900 MAIN STREET, 5TH FLOOR
RIVERSIDE, CA 92522

BOB WILSON
300 N. FLOWER STREET, 813
SANTA ANA, CA 92703-5000

350

WILLIAM K. SANDERS
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4682

MALCOLM YEUNG
STAFF ATTORNEY
ASIAN LAW CAUCUS
2000
939 MARKET ST., SUITE 201
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

GREG STEPHANICICH
RICHARDS, WATSON & GERSHON
44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 3800

LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

JONATHAN L. KRAMER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
KRAMER TELECOM LAW FIRM
2001 S. BARRINGTON AVE.,

LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

STEVEN LASTOMIRSKY
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
1200 THIRD AVENUE, 11TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

AARON C. HARP
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH
3300 NEWPORT BLVD
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92658-8915

CHRISTINE MAILLOUX
ATTORNEY AT LAW
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

JEFFREY LO
ASIAN LAW CAUCUS
939 MARKET STREET, SUITE 201
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

RANDLOPH W. DEUTSCH
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
555 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

MARGARET L. TOBIAS
TOBIAS LAW OFFICE
460 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104-4811

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

PETER A. CASCIATO
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
355 BRYANT STREET, SUITE 410
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

NOEL GIELEGHEM
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER LLP
201 CALIFORNIA ST. 17TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

JOSE E. GUZMAN, JR.
NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT LLP
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR
800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4799

KATIE NELSON
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-6533

GRANT GUERRA
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442
501
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120-7442

WILLIAM L. LOWERY
MILLER VAN EATON, LLP
400 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121

GRANT KOLLING
SENIOR ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF PALO ALTO
250 HAMILTON AVENUE, 8TH FLOOR
SUITE 100
PALO ALTO, CA 94301

DAVID HANKIN
VP, GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
RCN CORPORATION
1400 FASHION ISLAND BLVD.,
SAN MATEO, CA 94404

MARK T. BOEHME
ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF CONCORD
1950 PARKSIDE DRIVE
CONCORD, CA 94510

PETER DRAGOVICH
ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER
CITY OF CONCORD
1950 PARKSIDE DRIVE, MS 01/A
CONCORD, CA 94519

THALIA N.C. GONZALEZ
LEGAL COUNSEL
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
AGENCY
1918 UNIVERSITY AVE., 2ND FLOOR
BERKELEY, CA 94704

SCOTT MCKOWN
C/O CONT OF MARIN ISTD
MARIN TELECOMMUNICATION
371 BEL MARIN KEYS BOULEVARD
NOVATO, CA 94941

BARRY F. MCCARTHY, ESQ.
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MCCARTHY & BARRY LLP
100 PARK CENTER PLAZA, SUITE 501
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

TIM HOLDEN
SIERRA NEVADA COMMUNICATIONS
PO BOX 281
STANDARD, CA 95373

CHARLES BORN
MANAGER, GOVERNMENT & EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
AFFAIRS
FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS OF CALIFORNIA
9260 E. STOCKTON BLVD.
ELK GROVE, CA 95624

JOE CHICOINE
MANAGER, STATE GOVERNMENT
FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS
PO BOX 340
ELK GROVE, CA 95759

KELLY E. BOYD
NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX AND ELLIOTT
915 L STREET, SUITE 1000
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

ROBERT A. RYAN
COUNTY COUNSEL
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
700 H STREET, SUITE 2650
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

SUE BUSKE
THE BUSKE GROUP
3001 J STREET, SUITE 201
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816

State Service

ALIK LEE
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
COMMISSION
TELECOMMUNICATIONS & CONSUMER ISSUES BRA
ROOM 4101
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ANNE NEVILLE
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES
CARRIER BRANCH
AREA 3-E
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

APRIL MULQUEEN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
COMMISSION
DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING
ROOM 5119
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JENNIE CHANDRA
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES
EXECUTIVE DIVISION
ROOM 5141
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JOSEPH WANZALA

MICHAEL OCHOA

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
COMMISSION
TELECOMMUNICATIONS & CONSUMER ISSUES BRA
ISSUES BRA
ROOM 4101
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES
TELECOMMUNICATIONS & CONSUMER
ROOM 4102
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ROBERT LEHMAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
COMMISSION
TELECOMMUNICATIONS & CONSUMER ISSUES BRA
ROOM 4102
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SINDY J. YUN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 4300
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE DIVISION
ISSUES BRA
ROOM 5204
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

WILLIAM JOHNSTON
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES
TELECOMMUNICATIONS & CONSUMER
ROOM 4101
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DELANEY HUNTER
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE DIVISION
AND COMMERC
770 L STREET, SUITE 1050
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

EDWARD RANDOLPH
CHIEF CONSULTANT
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE/UTILITIES
STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

RANDY CHINN
SENATE ENERGY UTILITIES & COMMUNICATIONS
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 4040
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

[Top of Page](#)
[Back to INDEX OF SERVICE LISTS](#)